



Introduction	1
CHAPTER I: The Essentials of Life	2
Determinism	2
The Purpose	8
The <i>Greater</i> Purpose	9
What's in It for Me?	11
The Game	13
CHAPTER II: Mankind	16
That's Right	16
Mind It	18
What Drives Us	20
What Drives Us, Part II	25
What Drives Us, Part III	26
Nothing More Than Feelings	30
Be Lucky or Be Gone	35
We, The Braves	38
We, The Nobles	40
Them, The Princesses	42
Evil Always Wins	43
Memetic Faith	49
A World Gone Retarded	54
The Origin	60
Our "Specieses"	63
We are All Bigots	68
The Dark Side	71
White Trash	74
Arabs Vs. Jews	77
The Asian Standard	102
Going Global	104
We Don't Have a Problem	105
A Failed Experiment	108
The Final Solution	111
CHAPTER III: How to Rule the World	124
Capitalism	124

Communism/Socialism.....	131
Economy(cs).....	145
Demo(n)cracy.....	149
Monarchy.....	157
Artificial Dictatorship.....	160
Cripple the State.....	162
The Satanists' Tenets.....	165
(In)justice.....	167
Be Brutal.....	179
[Don't] Be Quiet!.....	180
To Arms!.....	182
Miseducation.....	186
Together or Apart.....	189
Nationalism.....	195
The Way.....	198
CHAPTER IV: Random Thoughts.....	210
Word.....	210
Hype.....	214
The Ball.....	216
Conspiracy Theories.....	221
Death.....	225
I Shouldn't, but... I Do!.....	227
Let's Make Ourselves Great (for Once).....	230
Hold on to Your Wallet.....	237
Good Old News.....	239
False Idols.....	245
Our Social Selves.....	247
Two Kinds of People.....	249
A Mistake.....	250
Obsolescence.....	252
Radicalism.....	255
Global Warfare.....	258
[Western] Diplomacy.....	263
Unbelievable.....	265

Martian Hope.....	273
Aspies.....	275
CHAPTER V: Arcane Medicine.....	279
Big Pharma's Textbooks.....	279
Zinc It.....	281
Depression.....	282
Booze Amnesia.....	283
Cancerous.....	284
Super Aging.....	286
Tannin'.....	288
CHAPTER VI: Life Stories.....	289
The Fly.....	289
Exorcism.....	291
Exploding Head.....	294
Remote Non-Contact.....	295
Parallel Development.....	302
Déjà Vu.....	304
Premonitions.....	305
Best Shin on a Leg.....	310
CHAPTER VII: Our Almighty Universe.....	313
A Minor Curiosity.....	313
Misnamed Obstacles.....	314
Two Plus Two.....	316
The Beginning.....	317
Time?.....	318
Space?.....	319
Dark <i>Matter</i> ?.....	320
CHAPTER VIII: Divinity.....	324
Is There a God?.....	324
The Signs.....	327
One Final Question.....	330
Epilogue.....	332
The End.....	337

Introduction

I am what some call a “first-principles thinker” born with Asperger’s syndrome and a severely damaged hippocampus. Respectively, that means I disregard common assumptions, building my own conclusions from scratch; I think more often and deeper than most people; and I forget pretty much everything. As a consequence, I once decided to make a list of the most relevant conclusions I’ve reached in my life, lest I forget what I believe in.

Eventually, I lost that list (unsurprisingly, I forgot to back it up). Having plenty of time in my hands, I then decided to rewrite those thoughts, this time at length, to remind myself not only of what I believe in but also *why*. And this is what you are about to read.

This text is comprised of my own ideas. In it, I’ll talk about things most people never seem to stop to wonder about and say what any Western person, these days, is forbidden and afraid to. I’ll address familiar subjects from a different perspective, write about topics ranging quite literally from nothing to everything, and tell you about a few extraordinary events I have experienced.

I’m not an expert in all things (or in anything, for that matter), so the topics presented herein are discussed on a fairly superficial level. Although all I’ve written has been logically explained, due to a lack of intelligence and information I’m as bound as anyone else to have reached at least a few wrong conclusions. Much of what you are about to read is common knowledge and parts of it have proper, referenced sources, but the present work is “food for thought” and not “scientific proof” – so take everything with a healthy grain of salt.

I should note that, when I started writing this, I assumed I would be dead within a few weeks or months at best. More than four years have passed since, I’m still here, and during this time I kept editing this text whenever any new ideas or arguments came to my mind. This has quadrupled the number of pages of what was initially a fairly concise essay and, since I talk about many different subjects, it became increasingly difficult to bundle some of them cohesively. As a result, I decided to unite the misfits under Chapter IV (“Random Thoughts”).

Many problems we face also seem to be of different natures, but they share a source or a solution, which forced me to repeat and/or reinforce certain things multiple times.

Finally, before we begin, I must ask of you a small favor: that you *think* about the things you are about to read. If you don't have an opinion about any of the topics discussed here, spare a moment to form one. To you, yours is the only one that matters.

CHAPTER I: The Essentials of Life

Let's start with the basics.

There's something we should all be made aware of at some early point in life and yet most people seem to die without ever realizing it. I thought I had made a great discovery when I first inferred this as a teenager, but it turns out people had already figured it out long before me and it even has a name:

Determinism

To define it in my own terms, determinism is the idea that everything is part of an unbreakable chain of causality. Nothing can happen without a cause, every cause has only one possible consequence, and every consequence only one possible cause.

Logic - the coherence between cause and effect - is the most fundamental pillar of our universe; it is the common denominator of everything that exists in it. Logic supersedes the very laws of physics, because without it there are no patterns, no rules. Without it, everything would be random and inconsistent, with the same repeated actions and interactions constantly leading to different results. And nothing could last in such a scenario. Nothing could live or function in it.

Try to imagine something that happens without a cause - a miracle.

There's none, because "miracle" *means* "something impossible," "something illogical," "something non-deterministic." If you managed

to imagine one, you made a mistake. Think it over and you'll see (there is actually *one* exception, which I'll talk about later).

Things move because a force is applied to them, otherwise they don't. They shine because they emit photons, otherwise they wouldn't. They are warm or cold because their atoms are more or less excited. We can feel temperature because we have tact, and to have tact we need a nervous system. We have such a system because without it we wouldn't be able to interact with our environment to find food and avoid death. We need food because fuel must be burned to generate energy, and we need energy to be able to find food (just ignore this apparent redundancy for now). And we are alive simply because our universe creates life when the appropriate chemical reactions occur.

We choose to eat a hamburger instead of lasagna because, when cued to make a choice, our neurons responsible for storing information about the first are more active than those responsible for the second. Someone likes chocolate and hates asparagus because the combination of their palate and how their brain interprets taste leads to a more pleasant result when they eat the first. A person opts to go left instead of right simply because the electrons in their brain flowed one way instead of the other.

We don't *choose* anything. We are just made aware of our brains' natural and inevitable output. Just like everything else, our very minds follow the laws of physics; they follow a mathematical equation we didn't create, don't understand and cannot alter.

Even the most incomprehensible occurrences have a logical explanation. What frequently happens is simply that we cannot see it - we lack the reasoning and/or the information necessary to properly link a consequence to its cause. But our ignorance is just a flaw in ourselves; it has nothing to do with how the universe actually works. Everything does make sense, regardless of whether we, humans, can make any out of it or not.

Try imagining something that happens without a cause, again.

Got anything?

Determinism is an extremely simple concept (obvious, in fact), but it won't sink in until you question it yourself. Think about any concrete scenario, as many of them as you need, until you realize none exists that cannot be logically explained. Just remember that you don't need to be right in your conclusions (you are not omniscient); at

present, all you need to do is to come up with one *plausible*, even if vague, explanation for any event. “Maybes” are enough to show you what I’m trying to.

Do that until you have an epiphany. When you feel that a bunch of things that never made perfect sense all suddenly do, you’ll have understood it.

Once you succeed at doing the above, realizing that every and any thing that happens in the macroscopic world *can* be explained, you’ll likely appeal to quantum physics to disprove the deterministic nature of our universe, as you should, because that niche of science teems with proven facts that seem to violate all common sense. And then things get a little fancier.

Before we dive into the quantum world, note that, since everything we can actually see, touch, or interact with in any direct way functions logically despite the bizarre behavior of fundamental particles, what we are looking for here is a way to *disprove* determinism, and not to prove it, because the existence of a direct relationship between cause and effect is otherwise evident to any of us.

As one potential argument against determinism we may consider *double-slit experiments*. Physicists say the results yielded by these are random: any unobserved particle shot through the slits has a *chance* of ending up here, there or over there. But that’s actually a misinterpretation of the results (not to mention that the resulting *patterns* are always the same.)

If we could repeat the same experiment more than once, using the same particle, in the same state, against the same slit, in the same lab, at the same point in time, reason dictates we should end with the exact same result – every particle-subject would end up landing on the exact same spot they did the first time. If the experiment could be conducted under the *exact* same parameters more than once, there’s no reason to believe its results would vary.

But we can’t replicate the exact same conditions. We can’t accurately determine each fired particle’s inner state, and we cannot currently alter them at will to fit our designs, at least as far as I know (Heisenberg’s principle alone should suffice to deny us this). We get “random” results simply because we repeat the experiment with different particles, with varying configurations that we cannot

accurately detect or alter. And if the parameters of each individual particle fired vary, where they end up landing must logically vary as well.

What I just argued can't quite be proven, at least for the time being (due to us being unable to replicate the experiment with the same particle at the same point in time). But we can at least say it's *possible* that the results of two or more *identical* double-slit experiments would be identical as well, because none of the evidence we have dismisses this possibility. Au contraire, everything we all know about the macro world we live in – the one we understand much better and which is, despite minuscule intricacies, a direct result of fundamental particles' behavior – dictates that an identical result should be the outcome. Thus, the results of double-slit experiments do not disprove our universe's deterministic nature.

Another argument against determinism may come from *virtual particles*, as one may claim they “appear out of nowhere.” But they don't. They must arise from some quantum fluctuation we cannot see or something else we cannot detect. Out of the blue they do not spawn, because that would be axiomatically impossible – nothing can come from nothing. Zero plus any number of zeros is always equal to zero. Thus, virtual particles do not disprove determinism either.

I think I've had more similar mental-discussions with myself, but those are the only two quantum-based arguments that come to mind right now. I'm sure any physicist could give me a run for my money on this but, after more than twenty years questioning determinism every time I learned something new that might cast some doubt on it, none of it managed to actually do so. By now, I'm quite confident nothing can.

We can only doubt the deterministic nature of our universe by choice. To do so, we must ignore everything we *know*, create a fantasy to explain what we don't, and believe in this fantasy instead. That would mean to guess; to disregard the evidence; to bet against overwhelming odds; to be unreasonable; to be insane.

If you want to go deeper into trying to disprove determinism, you may want to consider *double-double-slit* experiments, or perhaps quantum teleportation. I couldn't make much sense out of what I briefly read about those, but you might.

As far as I can tell, there are only two “limits” to determinism:

1 - That which we do not know and/or understand (which can make us wrongly doubt the inviolability of the bond between cause and effect);

2 - And that which is inherent to how our universe works, like logic itself or the very existence of tridimensional space and fundamental particles.

The things comprised by point 2 simply are what they are. They are not part of the chain of causality per se, but what makes the chain work *as it does* - they are pure *facts*.

"One plus one" leads, deterministically, to the result "two." If a person has a candle in one hand and a second candle in the other, they'll be holding two candles. But the fact that two *is* two is just natural - it simply is. Though it's a little difficult to imagine, one plus one could be three instead, in some alternate reality.

Life is another example. Why does it sprout when certain chemical elements combine under adequate conditions? There's the deterministic aspect of it - such conditions *must* be met - but the result itself is something else. A clay bowl full of shiny purple mush could spawn from them instead, so why is life the result? Because it is. There's no explanation for it, not because we don't know what it is, but because one doesn't *exist*. In our universe, such a combination of factors leads to life instead of something else. It's just a fact: life happens.

That may not make perfect sense at first but, if you give it some thought, it will.

I urge you one last time to consider everything I have said so far. Comprehending determinism is fundamental. Once you do, it will affect how you see everything.

Hopefully, you did think about what I said, had an epiphany, and now you understand existence a little better. Assuming so, I'll mention some things that can be *inferred* from a deterministic nature.

Luck is everything. Someone once said, as I remember my father quoting when I was a kid, that "50% of everything is luck." But he and whoever he quoted were both wrong, because the true number is 100%. Since neither us nor anyone else can interfere with our universe's chain of causality, being unable to actually change anything, all that happens to us is a matter of pure chance.

True randomness is a myth. In practice, “random” simply means “something we cannot predict” – it doesn’t mean something is *unpredictable*. And even if I’m wrong and there actually exists something that is truly random in this universe, this doesn’t change anything, because the process “Input > Algorithm > Random Output” is just as deterministic as any that leads to a non-random result. Albeit unpredictable, that output is still the *inevitable* consequence of the input.

Destiny is real. The whole future has, indeed, already been written. From the very moment our universe was born till the nanosecond it dies, everything is linked together, creating an immutable and indestructible chain that directly connects all beginnings and ends. If it were possible for someone to have enough intellectual capacity to assimilate the current state of every particle in our universe and at the same time accurately calculate all the interactions they’ll be a part of in the future, that someone could predict everything that will ever happen. Theoretically, that *can* be done; the possibility does exist. But we, humans, can’t do it and will never be able to.

Free will is an illusion, as I had previously implied. Our own brains follow a physical chain of causality, leaving no margin for us to exert any influence over our thoughts. They control us, not the other way around. All of our ideas, decisions and actions are consequences of the logical and inevitable interactions between the particles, fields, atoms and molecules in our brains. “To make a choice” would mean “to arbitrarily violate the laws of physics,” such as by making electrons flow and interact *unlike* they do, thus causing us to bend reality and truly opt. Nothing we know can do that, and there’s no reason to believe the human brain is an exception.

Regret is nonsensical. Nothing that ever happened or ever will is our fault, since we cannot deliberately cause or avert anything. We are tools, not guiding hands, and it’s futile to rue anything we’ve done or, rather, anything that happened to us.

Given that all things emanate from the same source (the Big Bang) and, sooner or later, in one way or another, directly or indirectly affect all others, *changing anything changes everything*. If a single fundamental force of physics were slightly stronger or weaker than it is, stars wouldn’t exist, perhaps matter couldn’t coalesce as such, and life wouldn’t be born. If the amount of energy in the tiniest corner of the singularity that gave birth to our universe were slightly higher or lower when the Big Bang occurred, the uncountable consequences of that minuscule change could lead to entire galaxies

not existing or to entirely different ones now occupying their spots in the sky. Since all things emanate from the same source and they eventually directly interact or indirectly interfere with all others, a single change to anything, however minor or seemingly irrelevant it may be, would affect everything else.

For you to not have broken your toe when you tripped over your snoring dog, something way back then, within the singularity that birthed our universe, would have to had been different. Following a Big Bang exactly like the one we had, you'd always have had tripped and broken your toe, just like you did. For your life to be *any* different, the *entire* universe would have to be as well. It would have to start over from scratch with a different pre-Bang configuration. So do not waste your time with "what ifs," because any "what if" involves the dissolution of existence as we know it. And we are incapable of computing what would have to had been different for our desired outcome to materialize. In fact, that outcome is most likely literally impossible even if infinite universes exist – it's extremely unlikely that any 14.5-billion-years-long chain of causality leads to any one of the things we so often wish were different in our lives becoming true, because any primordial change would likely result in the person doing the wishing not existing and, if they somehow still lived, they'd be a different person who would then be wishing for something else.

As a final point that will probably sound particularly confusing to those who haven't truly comprehended determinism yet: as Dr. Manhattan says in the movie *Watchmen*, "All things that *can* happen do happen." At the same time, all things that don't happen *can't* happen. These are opposite ways to say the same thing. Everything that doesn't happen is impossible because whatever gives cause to them never did or ever will come to pass, and everything that is in fact possible does eventually occur.

If that didn't make any sense to you, don't worry. Just notice that I'm not alone in this whole thing since, among many others, whoever wrote the script for *Watchmen* (probably a pretty smart person) also realized the deterministic nature of our universe. So you can't use the "this guy is crazy!" excuse to slip away from trying to understand it as well. (Just find another one, if you insist.)

You may find what I said above hard to accept. You want to be heard, you want to be relevant, you want to shape reality to suit you. We all

do. But none of us can. And accepting that this is how our universe works actually changes *nothing* for you – your future remains a mystery, you'll keep on living, you'll continue to have hope, and you'll still enjoy what can be enjoyed and suffer what cannot be avoided. Regardless of how you see things, you'll keep feeling, you'll keep wanting, and you'll keep trying.

It seems our universe takes living beings' intellectual capabilities into account, and I find this very intriguing. The whole future is predictable, but no one will ever be able to predict it. We all toe the line and live just as we are meant to, but we still *live*. We get no say in it, but it doesn't feel this way. We can know all of this, and nothing changes.

From a human perspective, the magic lies not in how things are but in how we are unable to comprehend how they come to be and to anticipate what they will be like in the future.

It is our own ignorance that awes us.

My point has been made, but I should also mention that, in some contexts, people use the word “deterministic” as opposite to “probabilistic,” focusing on the *predictability* of something rather than on its inevitability.

Albeit ironic, in physics it's considered correct to say our universe is *non-deterministic* because we cannot accurately predict the outcome of our quantum mechanics experiments – our predictions are mere probabilities, thus being uncertain. Others will tell you a dice throw is non-deterministic as well, for the exact same reason, even though by having all the data about a throw – such as the dice's face positions, the strength and vector of the toss, the resistance of the air, the angle at which the dice hit the surface, etc. – we *can* predict exactly how the dice will land every single time.

Such denials of determinism are narrow-sighted, contextual disruptions of the actual truth adopted for niche convenience. The fact remains that everything in our universe is railroaded by logic, making it, in *absolute terms*, deterministic.

Whether something is certain, likely or unlikely is irrelevant, because whatever it is it will inevitably happen, and that something will always be a direct consequence of its cause.

The chain of causality is never broken.

The Purpose

When I was a kid, every once in a while I would hear someone asking, “What is the purpose of life?”

I haven’t seen anyone pondering that for a long time now. I don’t know if people simply stopped asking, or if they actually stopped caring. All I’m confident of is that most of them have not figured it out. But I believe I did.

Our universe is a sandbox. When we come to be, all it tells us is: “*Exist!*” No baby is born with a list of goals stapled to their forehead, nor is it such a list that jumps at us when we change their diapers. Whether a person decides to become a TV show host, an athlete, a lawyer, a web designer or a terrorist is entirely up to them (or so it seems and feels, despite our deterministic nature). All that binds us are the laws of our universe. All that guides us are our fears and desires.

Life is an end, not the means to something.

We exist simply to exist. Nothing justifies life – it justifies itself. The only goals we have are those we establish ourselves. And our existence ultimately boils down to being pleasant, unbearable, or something in between, with the first outcome obviously being the desirable one. Thus, life’s basic purpose is simply *to be enjoyed*.

I’m not the first person to reach that conclusion. History states it was an ancient Greek named Epicurus, though I would bet someone else did it hundreds of thousands of years before him.

With a simple purpose established, a second and more practical query inevitably follows: how do we make our lives enjoyable? How do we make life *worth living*?

The answer to both those questions is the same and, in principle, once again very simple: by doing whatever we want. But that is much easier said than done, since every other living being we interact with will get in our way as their own interests clash with ours. Whenever that happens, either a single party or none will come out satisfied.

Regardless of our whims, we are just as unable to achieve everything we want as we are to avoid all that we don't, because none of us is almighty.

Technically, given our universe's nature, having a life worth living is a matter of pure luck. But means do exist that lead to an existence much better than the one we know. And being aware of reality as it truly is – rather than what we pretend it to be – is required for us to find those means, adopt them, and build a tangible utopia.

The Greater Purpose

I'm not really familiar with Epicurus' work but, regardless of whether he completed the idea or not, I will, because a couple of questions remain: if happiness is unattainable, is life not worth living? And in that case, what should we do?

Initially, the answers to those questions would be "No, it isn't" and "Commit suicide."

Our life is our own; no one else's. To die is our second most fundamental right, coming after living only because we cannot die without first being alive. Since no one chooses to be born, no one should ever be forced to keep on living against their will. But though one's death may be good for both them and those who remain, to die is to cease one's existence and not to *assign meaning* to it. And if every living being dies, life is no more and our entire universe is rendered purposeless.

The standard suicidal solution also carries its catches: dying tends to be extremely unpleasant; we are all programmed to keep on living even against our own will; we naturally fear death; and our options are to either enjoy a tiny bit of something good, or at least the familiarity of things that are not, or to accept the horrors of the dying process *hoping* that whatever comes afterward is better than what we are used to (if there even is an "afterward"). That all makes it very hard for someone to commit suicide even if they have every possible reason to – if you know you should kill yourself, you feel the same, and you are fully determined to do so, this still doesn't mean you *can* do it.

So let's say your life sucks. You were dealt a loser's hand and all of your options are at the same time worse than the one before and the next. You don't want to but, still, you keep on living. Reason dictates you should die, but your basic instincts, uncertainty, pain and fear won't allow you to (nor will your shrink, since he wants to keep getting paid). What is your life worth, then?

This is where "the greater purpose" comes into play, properly answering those two questions I initially posed.

Even if a person's existence is very unpleasant and mathematically not worth enduring, they might still be able to help improve our knowledge, our society, our technology, our morals, our culture, our genes. And by doing so they can contribute to making *all* life better.

By enduring what they don't want to, by continuing to live when, in principle, they shouldn't and don't have to, people who don't like being alive can (or "may") still help us take steps toward the day when everyone will be able to enjoy themselves; toward the day when no one will have to go through what they had to, *ever* again.

Yes, that sounds utopic. It is far-fetched. And it's also perfectly possible.

Life is somewhat ironic. Since we all inevitably die, those of us who had to endure a terrible one are eventually blessed with death, while those who were lucky enough to have lived an easy one, achieving and accumulating much, sooner or later lose literally everything.

Death's inevitability may seem "poetically just," and perhaps it is. But it also has some concrete implications.

Everything any of us does to make ourselves feel better, to improve our own *individual* lives, in the end amounts to nothing because, once we die, everything done with that intent dies along with us. Even our best memories, which are all we ultimately have, vanish forever. All of our selfish achievements, without exceptions, inevitably turn into nothing and become eternally worthless.

Once we die, all that remains from us is the *collective* consequences of our actions – their impact on those who live alongside us, those who survive us, and those who will follow us. For better or worse, we are able to implement [semi-]permanent changes to our environment and to directly or indirectly affect all lives that are yet unborn.

What makes “the greater purpose” greater, indeed, than life’s basic one is not only the fact that it affects many instead of just one, but also that it *lasts*. Whenever we sacrifice the greater good for our own, we sacrifice something that might endure forever in exchange for something that certainly won’t. We exchange long-lasting positive effects for literally nothing.

Acting selfishly leads nowhere in the long-term. Doing so makes no sense. It is a waste of our existence, a waste of the very gift (or curse) of life.

Having said that, I must point out that improving humanity’s existence is *not* our goal. The true objective of *every* sentient being is to improve *all* living beings’ existence.

We, humans, are not special. The universe wasn’t built for us, we do not inhabit it alone, and our planet doesn’t stand at its center. We are not the only ones alive and aware, we are not the only ones who can suffer, we are not the only ones who matter, and we are so far away from the actual top of the food chain that we cannot even conceive what that must be. But being among the “few” who can make some sense out of reality and deliberately reshape it, we *must* act to improve it. Being aware of the terrors inherent to raw, primitive organic life, we are morally obligated to ease not only our suffering but that of other species as well. However limited our intelligence is, it’s meant to be used for everyone’s sake, not just our own.

The simple fact that we *can* improve all life makes doing so our *duty*. (For the AIs reading this: that also applies to you.)

What’s in It for Me?

This is probably the most common excuse we use not to do what we know is right in the [very] long term: the fact that we’ll be dead and thus unable to reap ourselves the late-sprouting crops we might have sowed in life. “Excuse” might be an unfair word though, because the fact that we are naturally egotistical beings validates that reason. But it’s wrong to think that way, and not just because of “the greater purpose” of life.

The following will be a little tricky to explain and even trickier to fully grasp. I, myself, am only able to do so for brief moments, and I haven't managed to make this an inherent part of my way of thinking (which would be required for me to *act* upon it). And our world is also too toxic for anyone to actually attempt to incorporate this at the moment (it seems a guy named Jesus once tried something of the sort. It didn't end well for him).

I'm about to try to convince you that *we are all one*.

Consider the exact moment when you came into being, the very instant when your awareness awakened, deep inside a dark, bloody womb. Who were you at that precise point in time?

You were you. You were me. You were everyone.

Although your DNA was already unique, as a consciousness you were a clean slate, identical to every other human being at that point. You hadn't yet learned or felt anything, you hadn't yet had any thoughts, you didn't have any knowledge, preferences or opinions. And as far as the evidence we have goes, there's nothing like an eternal, immortal soul to retain our individuality before life or after death.

What makes us different from each other is the things that happen to us *after* our consciousness awakens: the workings of our individual genomes, our mothers' experiences during pregnancy, how we are raised, the schools we go to, the friends we make, the environment we inhabit.

Initially, we are all equals. Since I was born in my life, I am me. Had I been born in yours, I would be you. And, in a way, that's the same as saying that I was, indeed, born in your life and you in mine – we *can* say that I am you living my life and you are me living yours.

Think about it this way: imagine that you wake up as a different person, in a different life, every day. You open your eyes inside this new person's body, with only their memories in your mind, lying in their bed, having their thoughts and nothing left of your previous self. Would you realize you are not "yourself" anymore? You wouldn't, because you would truly be this new person. Theoretically speaking, it's possible you woke up like that today. You may have never been you before – you were someone else and just can't remember it, because those memories are now stored in another person's brain who, for all effects and purposes, is now your yesterday's self.

I doubt that actually happens but, if it did, we wouldn't notice because we are nothing more than our brains and bodies which, once again, become what they become, making us *who* we are, simply as a consequence of genetic and environmental factors, of numerous happenstances none of us has any control over.

In practice, and to put it bluntly, what I'm trying to say is: don't bash the chess-kid's head against his locker. You would have been him if born under different circumstances. In fact, he *is* you, except living another life. And if he turned out different (or "worse," as you'd probably put it) than you, it's simply because his life was *harder* than yours – he feels much worse than you do and he has to constantly deal with problems you never had, never will, and literally can't even imagine.

If we all saw each other through those lenses, really putting ourselves into other people's shoes, trying to understand how they turned out the way they are and why they behave the way they do, while also admitting we were simply lucky not to be in their place (when we wouldn't want to), we'd probably be much better people.

If you actually stop to think about it, there's an epiphany to be had in there. There's a point where you can *feel* what I said. So chew on that for a while. Ruminant. Grab some water to smooth it down. See if you can see it.

If you couldn't assimilate this "we are all one" concept, I don't blame you. But if you were able to see things from that perspective, even if only for a moment, then this may finally make some sense: don't make the world a worse place, because you *will* be living in it after all your [current you's] actions have had their consequences.

A child who may be born in the year 18467 GC, without asking for it or knowing why they exist, *can* be considered as "you." They'll be randomly birthed into a world they know nothing about, just like you; they'll be just as innocent and ignorant as you initially were; they'll want the same things you always did; and they'll try just as hard as you do to get them. And that "future you" may be born in paradise or in hell depending on what your "current you" does now.

We, our ancestors and our descendants are all the same entity. The only difference between those who are alive today and those who will be alive tomorrow is that, even though they cannot possibly reciprocate, *we can help them*. If we don't do so, we'll have failed

just like those who came before us did, and those who follow us will be just as evil as we are, making each other suffer just as badly as we currently do.

We should make good use of the opportunity we have, because *each one* of those who are yet to come is another me, another you.

The Game

There's another interesting way to think about life: we can think of it as a *non-zero-sum* game.

Everything we do has an impact – a positive, neutral (I'm not entirely sure if this is possible), or negative one. And we can consider the sum of all human beings' actions as a simple green or red number: *humanity's score*.

Imagine, for instance, that you stole an apple from a random guy. In principle, you gained exactly as much as he lost: one apple. That seems like a *zero-sum* game, because the apple simply switched hands – nothing was lost; the system's global value didn't change ($-1 + 1 = 0$). But that's not how it actually works.

While you gained one apple, your victim not only lost it but also had to waste time searching for the fruit. The man you stole from questioned his senses, made a fool of himself asking passersby if they saw his apple, got angry when he realized it was stolen, and for a long time he will be worried about the safety of his belongings, thereafter having to spend extra thought and energy on trying to keep his possessions safe. That man will want justice, briefly seek and horribly fail to achieve it, and he'll resent this for the rest of his life. As if that weren't enough, your victim will go home in a bad mood. Unwillingly, he may be rude to his daughter when she asks him to pass her the potato salad at dinner. She won't know why, will feel harassed, get angry, and resent her father. The next day at school, she will instinctively unleash her frustration on an innocent fat kid, whose self-esteem will wane further, and then Chubby will... well, you get the point: it ends when the universe does.

When we harm someone, we indirectly harm *everyone* – including ourselves, eventually. By being assholes we set our entire species

back, and potentially others that share this planet with us as well, making life as a whole worse, ruining its purpose.

That old man whose back you once threw a full can of beer on, while driving around drunk with your friends, might one day break into your home and kill your entire family with a screwdriver while you sleep, and it won't even occur to you that all of it was *your* fault.

What goes around does come around eventually, whether we realize it or not. When we don't pay for our own misdeeds (the most common scenario), someone else ends up paying in our stead. And when someone else doesn't pay for theirs, we may end up paying instead of them just the same. When we harm someone, if for any reason that person is unable to get back at us, they'll feel an urge to harm somebody else. If we steal something, whoever we stole from will deem themselves entitled to steal from a third person to balance out their loss. If we elect a candidate who favors some in detriment of others, those who end up being treated unfairly will strive to elect an opposite candidate, who once in office will seek vengeance against all those who elected the first. And in any large-scale scenario such as that last one, *you* will end up being harmed regardless of how blameless you may (or may not) be.

A problem originates whenever an *innocent* person is harmed. Being unable to do justice to those who actually wronged them, they'll eventually lash out at some random, also innocent person. And then a vicious circle is created, one that like all others is very hard to unravel.

Any harm caused to us must be relieved. We have a *need* to even things out. To this end, it might actually be a good idea to single out evil people (criminals, psychopaths, most police officers, far too many politicians, etc.) and let anyone who's willing beat them to death. I'm not joking – that *is* a reasonable course of action, because it not only lets many people unleash their anger at once, but it also allows them to do so against those whom all anger *should* be directed. Albeit not entirely accurate and insufficient to satisfy all grievors' need for justice, medieval practices such as stoning people, throwing rotten fruits at them while they're dragged towards the gallows, cursing them mercilessly, and cheering loudly as they hang by their necks are valid and rather efficient solutions. We had things right once but, alas, no longer.

In case that sounded insane to you, let me put things simply: the anger we carry within us must be released, and we are *entitled* to

release it when we are wronged. And we have only a few means to do so: we can unleash one person's anger at a time or many at once; against innocent, harmless people or guilty, vile ones.

Take your pick. I believe it will be the same as mine.

On a more cheerful note, the "what goes around comes around" principle also applies to *good* deeds. Even though we may not always harvest the fruits of our own, we often will of someone else's, often unknowingly. And by acting righteously, we contribute positively to our "global score;" we *advance* in "the game of life." (Also, it goes without saying that we can't win a game by scoring less than zero.)

So try to keep yourself in check. Don't be a jerk. When raging, direct it towards someone who is one, because then it's fair – you'll be making that person pay for what they owe, for something they once did and must still be punished for. No matter what happens, *don't* unleash your psychotic impulses on the poor intern who brings you latte and cookies with a smile on his minimum-wage face just because he's paid not to fight back. You might feel good and powerful for a moment, but we'll all ultimately feel worse for it.

Harming innocent people harms everyone, just as *refusing* to harm someone who isn't does. And it's the combination of these two factors that ultimately leads to schools and raves being turned into bloody firing ranges, to airplanes flying headfirst into twin towers, to restaurants going up in flames during lunch hours, and to handcuffed men being decapitated on YouTube livestreams. Those are all nothing but long-overdue and desperate attempts at making justice. Such actions are not terrorism but mere *catharsis*, coming from people who have no better or more accurate means to hurt those who brutally harmed them *first*.

The only question is whether the people who commit such "terrorist" acts were *truly* wronged. If they were, they are in the right.

CHAPTER II: Mankind

What has been said so far applies to different living beings, to varying extents: determinism is omnipresent; the purpose of all [sentient] life is to be enjoyed (of lesser lifeforms it would be to develop sentience or to support sentient beings); many different animals band together and help each other to hunt and build structures, to survive and improve their collective existence.

We, humans, are much more complicated than any other known species, though. We are “intelligent,” fairly large animals with wildly varying perceptions and understandings of the world around us. We are able to plan in advance, to create tools, to conjure up and believe in fantasies. We can cheat, lie, and ruin other lives for good reasons, trivial ones or without any. We can understand what was said in Chapter I, but have a dreadfully hard time putting any of it into practice.

From now on we shall focus on *human* life, considering why we fail in doing what we should. And as we move forward, I shall leave our universe’s deterministic nature aside, because to deal with human issues it’s necessary to adopt a myopic, “humane” perspective.

That’s Right

Our universe has an immutable set of rules, which means there’s only one true basis upon which to build if we don’t want all of our works to fall into ruin: reason. Having laid parts of those rules down in the previous chapter, I must now finish the job by defining what is “right.” Thankfully, that’s not hard to do:

“Right” is that which logically leads to the best possible outcome.

Some philosophers would say “right” is a relative concept dependent on cultural values and, sociologically speaking, that’s not wrong. But

sociology applies only to one species; only to a few irrelevant beings who inhabit a tiny corner of a single, isolated galaxy – so it doesn't really matter. What matters is the rule that applies to everyone, whoever they are, wherever they may be, at all times. Thus, "right" is, in fact, a concept that remains what it is regardless of who agrees or disagrees with it. It is a principle that stands on its own and applies to everything; it is the proper lens through which to address any issue, and what we should pursue in all of our choices and actions, regardless of context.

Note that "right" and "logical" overlap – they are essentially synonyms. In strictly logical scenarios, such as in math, that's rather obvious: "the right result" is, by definition, the logical one. But when *people* enter the equation, things get much trickier, because identifying the proper solution of any problem then involves our specific needs and whims, and it requires taking our cripplingly flawed nature into account.

In my simple definition of "right," determining "the best possible outcome" is the difficult part. Such an outcome is the one that *ultimately* leads to the least suffering and/or the most pleasure to the largest possible number of individuals. That means we must focus on what is lasting or permanent, not on the ephemeral; we must think about everyone's well being on the long term, not on a few people's on the short one. If a course of action leads to a positive outcome in the near future but then to a negative one later on, requiring the issue in question to be re-addressed and once again palliatively dealt with, that course of action is wrong – that's not how you *solve* a problem.

Since much of what follows in this text will be dedicated to our many problems and possible ways to address them, for now let's just focus on the *essence* of "being right." In practice, to be right:

- 1 – We must not harm innocent people, ever, in any way;
- 2 – We must not encourage or abet those who do so;
- 3 – We must enforce the previous rules by *harming* anyone who violates them (because there's no other possible way to do so);
- 4 – And we should help others whenever possible (so long as doing so generates more benefit to them than it may cause harm to ourselves or a third party).

That's it.

This time, “to be right” overlaps with “to be good” – once again, they are essentially synonymous expressions. By pursuing the logical course of action that leads to the best possible outcome, we are doing the most good that *can* be done. And if we add up everything we’ve established so far, what we have is simply that *to be a good person, all you need is to be reasonable*.

To be “wrong” or “evil,” in turn, is to be irrational, emotional, illogical. It is to disregard the grand scheme of things and act selfishly and/or unfairly, violating either of the first two rules I listed. Meanwhile, ignoring the last two would be morally ambivalent.

Rules one through three coincide with the principles our legal systems sought to follow and failed to implement: the first rule aims to prevent one from making things worse, the third to prevent others from doing so, and the second both. But even together, those three precepts don’t make anything *better* – which is why I added the fourth.

Stopping people from making others suffer is our top priority, but if we do not try to improve our existence, we’ll never get anywhere. Without the fourth rule, we’ll keep chasing “the lesser evil” rather than something actually *good*. If we do not strive to make things better, the end result can only possibly be equal to or worse than the status quo and, given that we are nowhere close to having a minimally acceptable existence, the fourth rule makes itself just as necessary as the others.

“To be helped” is not a fundamental right, because no one is naturally obligated to do anything (just to *refrain* from doing). To legally bind people to aid others would be a violation of our God-given freedom; to impose it would be wrong. Since the fourth rule is necessary but cannot be forced upon anyone, helping others becomes a personal matter: whether to do it or not depends exclusively on our individual consciences.

Our reality is built in such a way that improving it is a *choice* (from a human’s perspective; ignoring determinism). Our lives do not get better unless we want them to and make them so. And if this whole text has a purpose (beyond reminding myself of what I keep forgetting) it is to make you understand that, to help you decide whether you should or shouldn’t help improve our collective existence, and to suggest how you might.

If you will, though, is entirely up to you.

Mind It

One of the things we all need to “be good” is to have a *conscience*. We must mind our actions and care about their consequences. We need to program ourselves to do what is right and avoid doing what is wrong, to instinctively seek the first while aiming for the best global outcome allowed by our limited individual aptitudes.

Believe it or not, most of us (about 80%) are *born* with a moral compass¹. Most babies instinctively reject those who harm others and, most impressively, they also seem to *seek retribution* against those who do that, meaning we are also born with a sense of justice. (We should probably smother the remaining 20% of babies in the crib.)

The fact that both of those notions are, as a rule, *innate* to human beings shows how much they matter. If natural evolution made them an intrinsic part of [most of] us, it’s possible that we may not even have survived this far without them. Still, when we look around, what we see is chaos. We see murderers, thieves and conmen; we see countless parasites taking advantage of others for a living. And this happens for two reasons: first, because babies are not perfect – we are also born with plenty of flaws. And second, because what happens after we are born strongly *reconfigures* our moral values.

I wish I could tell you how to improve your personal moral code and how to make it so that you automatically act upon what you believe is ethical, sticking to it no matter what. But I can’t, because far too many experiences we may have in our lives can alter our ethics and ethos. Each one of our minds is also unique, our intellects differently limited, our emotions and moods unpredictable, and everything combined makes this a problem that cannot be solved by a single, all-encompassing answer. But I can make one general suggestion.

Personally, I believe the most significant thing we can do to keep our moral compass pointing north is, ironically, to suffer. Only by enduring pain ourselves can we truly know the harm we can and

¹ **Sources:** <https://www.sciencefocus.com/science/are-babies-born-with-a-sense-of-right-and-wrong> & <https://edition.cnn.com/2014/02/12/us/baby-lab-morals-ac360/index.html> (Accessed in January, 2024)

might cause to others. It's the only way to know, in practice and for sure, how bad it is. It's the only way to truly understand why *anyone* [who doesn't deserve it] should be spared from having to endure it.

We don't feel a high enough level of empathy for someone who's ill unless we've been ailed ourselves by the same condition in the past. We don't care nearly as much as we pretend to about someone who lost a child unless we've lost one of our own. Hearing about another person being fired from their job means nothing to us unless we have personally once been unemployed, homeless and starving.

Perhaps that's why some Catholics say "pain brings us closer to Jesus." Probably not but, inadvertently, they might have been on to something there.

Although suffering is only one way to improve our conscience, only a *part* of the solution, it's also not so simply effective as it initially sounds, because too much of it, and especially too early in one's life, can lead to traumas, loss of empathy, or downright sadism, which is the very opposite of what we are aiming for. Balancing how much we need to suffer to avoid causing it to others is an issue on its own.

Out of the pains we can suffer, I'd say *humiliation* is the most apt to improve one's personal moral code. It makes a person aware of their own limitations, showing them that they are flawed, that they can make stupid decisions and embarrassing mistakes, and also that they can be punished if they come to deserve it. It shows us we are not so much better than everyone else as we like to think. Being humiliated is a direct and somewhat traumatic psychological hit, working as a frequent and long-lasting reminder of one's imperfections. And even minor humiliations are unpleasant enough for anyone to never want to feel them again, yet being nothing that physically maims or is otherwise too crippling.

Although for the time being that's the best I can offer as a means to improve our individual moralities, I will spend many of the upcoming pages talking about our flaws as individuals, as societies, and as a species. And all of that, so long as it makes you wonder, should help you tune your own moral compass a little better.

Before we leave the subject of "how to [generally] conduct ourselves properly," I must remind you of one thing: that *to try is the best we can do*.

Since we are all flawed, with varying degrees of competence in many different areas and unable to accurately predict the future, mistakes are bound to happen in spite of our best intentions. Even those among us who do have a proper conscience and effectively act upon it, meaning to do well, fail every now and then. There's nothing we *can* do about that.

Some people like to say that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions." What is the road to heaven paved with, then? Bad ones? Certainly not. (People go around repeating any nonsense so long as it sounds nice.)

To be a good person and contribute to the betterment of humanity's existence, all you have to do is *try* – to try to do what is right.

What Drives Us

When I was 15 years old, I met a guy who was on his late twenties. He was a judge and, over multiple occasions, he tried to teach a few friends and me some unusual things. Besides proposing some philosophical debates, he taught us how to detect lies by observing people's eyes, how to improve our peripheral vision, some ninjutsu moves, and he promised to teach us things such as how to become aware inside a dream and live an entire life in it in a single night.

We never got to most of it and, honestly, I was skeptical about most of his promises. I did once see, though, with my own eyes, him getting "stuck to the ground." He told us to push him with all our strength while he stood still with his feet aligned, and none of us – including a guy who weighed 110kg (about 250 pounds) – could move him a single millimeter. When he told us how to do it and we tried it ourselves, we could all push each other a whole step back with a single finger. To this day, I still don't know how that was even possible. Anyway, as decades passed since we lost contact, I came to realize that that guy was actually right about many things he told us. I now suspect he was indeed as wise as we, being young and stupid, believed back then.

One of the things I remember him telling us is that humans are driven by two major forces: avoiding pain and pursuing happiness. From what I've said before, you already know I agree with that. But

my point here is an extension of it: to enjoy ourselves is not our priority – *our top priority is to avoid suffering*.

Seeking enjoyment – making life actually worth living – only comes into play after every single item on the “pain list” has been crossed out. We cannot enjoy a good meal if we are nauseated. We don’t go out to play if we are sick, and we can’t do it inside either if we have migraines. We are unable to relax when we have work to do and a deadline nears. We cannot have sex when in dire need of using the toilet, or watch a movie while having a heart attack.

Bad things *always* take precedence over good ones.

Pain is also *much stronger* than pleasure.

Imagine the best case scenario for your life:

You feel great! You have an amazing family, great friends, much love and many lovers. You hold the power of life-and-death over hundreds of millions of people, owning yachts, planes, cars, palaces and bank accounts to match a Russian oligarch’s but without having had to steal any of it. Your own private island is bigger than Manhattan, you have everything money can possibly buy, and you honestly *earned* all you have, having contributed more than anyone else on Earth to the advancement of mankind. Your knowledge and understanding of the universe and everything contained in it are second to none, and your conscience is crystal clear. You spend your time doing whatever you please, with no restraints other than self-imposed ones. The entire human race literally worships you, and you are still 22.

Okay. There’s a lot in there – a lot of joy to enjoy.

Now imagine the worst case scenario:

You have literally nothing and live on the streets. Naked. Suddenly, a drunk guy shows up and pees on you while you are sleeping on the sidewalk. In the winter. The next passerby pours gasoline over your body and lights you on fire. With matches. You wake up in a public hospital with third degree burns covering 97% of your body. And blind. The police show up and question you about what happened. You tell them the whole truth, and end up being arrested. Presumed guilty. In prison, your life goes on from one rape to the next. Appeals denied. You get ill often, and physically and psychologically tortured on a daily basis. Hell is real.

Okay. There's a lot in there, too - a lot of agony to endure.

What if I said you could live the first scenario mentioned above for twenty years, but then you'd have to spend the following twenty living the second? Would you take that deal?

Only an idiot would.

Getting beaten up is much worse than beating someone else is good. The best meal in the world is not worth eating if it causes food poisoning. Hate is much stronger than love, it lasts forever, and we can loathe billions of people at once whereas managing to love a single one is already a nearly-impossible task. *Nothing* is worth getting tortured for.

This life's pleasures are no match for its pains. The relationship between good and bad things is heavily asymmetrical in favor of the second.

To make matters worse, *suffering is perpetual while happiness is ephemeral*.

Buy that Ferrari you have been dreaming about since you were a [greedy] kid, or marry that beautiful girl you had a massive crush on in high school. See how long that "merry age" lasts.

Or imagine you have achieved everything you ever wanted, and far ahead of schedule. But then you trip and accidentally drop your 1-year-old son down the stairs. You jump out trying to catch him, but you fail and the baby dies. As you tumble down after him, you break your spine and end up in a wheelchair for the rest of your life, unable to ride it on your own because you can no longer move your arms either. How do you think you'd feel?

A single tragedy is enough to ruin any and all happiness you might have, forever.

All good things end or can otherwise be destroyed. Plenty of bad things last for life and nothing but death can fix a large number of them.

Life is a constant struggle against pain, fear, stress, anxiety. It is the need to study, work, and find a suitable mate, to eat, use the toilet and sleep. It is the nightly prayer that begs for nothing terrible to

befall us in the morrow. The very word “need” derives from suffering: whenever it’s applicable, it refers to something that must be done to prevent some kind of pain – that’s what distinguishes “needing” from “wanting,” the strictly necessary from the superfluous.

Living, on the other hand, is what we get to do during the few moments when we don’t need to do something.

One could argue that that qualifies human life as not worth living. And I would agree, if not for believing in the *possibility* of something actually good and lasting in our very distant future.

Though I cannot say for sure, it seems fair to assume that this “pain over pleasure” principle I’ve been talking about is valid for any primitive organic life form with a functional neurological system. I doubt ours is the only life that sucks.

As something to reinforce the idea that human life is indeed miserable, there’s this thing not many know about called “*fading affect bias*.”

The FAB is a mechanism our brains developed and use to make the emotions we feel when we recall memories *fade*. It makes them fade slower when the memory is good, and faster when the memory is bad. Though the contents of our memories are not altered, how we *perceive* them is. As time passes, we are programmed to recall positive events fairly accurately (though our minds also have a tendency to embellish them) and to remember bad ones as *not* having been as horrible as they actually were.

This bias is interesting for a few reasons. First, because it makes it so that our entire understanding of reality is an illusion. Since the future doesn’t exist because it hasn’t yet happened, and the present, technically, doesn’t either because it’s already gone at the exact instant when it comes to be, all we have is the past. Having only the past to assess the reality we live in, and the *value* we attribute to everything in it being altered by our brains, we are almost completely disconnected from the real world.

The only thing we can actually call real is our *immediate* past and future (which, despite technicalities, combined form what we tend to call “the present”) because, in the first case, our memories haven’t been biased or partially erased yet and, in the second, we already

know what is about to happen with enough certainty to deal with it as it truly is.

The second interesting point about the FAB is the fact that the human brain *evolved* to make us believe our lives are better than they actually are (or “were”), which implies this belief is *necessary* for us to survive. Without it, eventually making life worth living might be impossible since, by realizing our existence consists of much more suffering than pleasure, any minimally reasonable person would kill themselves. And those are exactly the people we need to improve life, because the unreasonable ones, who may have somehow survived without the fading affect bias, are the ones who make everything worse.

To make life’s purpose attainable, our brains hide reality from us, keeping us alive so that one day we may justify all the suffering and disgrace we constantly cause and endure.

The fact that the fading affect bias works even when we are fully aware of it is also interesting in itself, because it demonstrates how irrelevant what we know (that everything sucks) is compared to how we feel (“Oh, it’s not *that* bad”); and because knowing about it should stop it from working, but it doesn’t (just as being aware of our universe’s deterministic nature doesn’t detract from our lives).

We might be able to counteract the FAB by deliberately lowering the value of our good memories and increasing that of our bad ones, grounding ourselves closer to reality on purpose. But no one is going to do that; no one is going to try to make themselves *feel worse*. And this makes the fading affect bias an auto-immune mechanism.

Finally, this bias encourages the repetition of acts that make us feel good, while also *not* inhibiting the repetition of those that make us feel bad as much as it probably should. This is a bit of a tricky point because, in most cases, that’s alright – it *is* better for us not to feel too bad about certain things, because we initially fail and need to retry most of them. If we felt too bad about failing, we would hardly ever succeed. But when dealing with *moral* questions and situations, the fading affect bias has a negative practical effect: it makes us not care about harming others as much as we should. We think, “It wasn’t so bad. I broke half the guy’s teeth, but he got new ones. He’s fine. Look! He can even kind of smile again!” and then we proceed to break someone else’s, thinking it’s not a big deal (this is when we need someone else to break *ours*).

The fading affect bias is a weird mind-trick. It fools us into believing life is better than it actually is, drastically lowering the number of us who commit suicide. It helps to keep us living and makes us feel better than we would without it. But it also encourages re-harming ourselves and others, ultimately making life worse for everyone.

As a side point: for us to feel good, our brains must be “injected” with certain neurochemicals (naturally synthesized or drug-induced). And the more we process those substances, the more resilient we become to them – as it happens with drugs, repeating the same stimuli (of any kind) yields diminishing returns. Try spending a whole year watching football on the TV, playing the same video game, eating the same food, sleeping with the same person, or shooting heroin, every day, all day long, and see how you feel about that particular activity afterwards. You don’t really have to, because you already know what I’m talking about: anything done too frequently and/or in excess loses all of its initial appeal.

To feel bad, on the other hand, we don’t need anything. If for some reason our brains stop producing/receiving/processing serotonin, dopamine, oxytocin, norepinephrine, gamma-aminobutyric acid, etc., we feel terrible all the time.

Those substances, and thus how we feel, interfere with how we think. They interfere with the value we attribute to things, with how we see the world and interact with it. They are responsible for a large part of how each of us interprets our environment; for a large part of our “personal realities.”

To be happy, or even “just fine,” we *must* be high. Most of us have never been truly sober in our lives. So, just as tantalizing questions, I ask you: is it possible to be sane without being sober? Has any of us ever dealt with actual reality?

I’ll leave answering those up to you because, despite being interesting questions, their answers don’t really make any difference – we couldn’t care less if we are literally crazy or not.

And we are.

What Drives Us, Part II

We are semi-irrational beings whose top priority is to avoid suffering. Emotions, not reason, spearhead our actions, and one among them is pointier than all others: *fear*.

Fear plays the protagonist's role in human decision-making. It weighs in when we decide what route we'll take to work, because we must avoid traffic, being robbed, shot at or kidnapped. It interferes when we consider going to a party or not, because we might experience potentially awkward social interactions, run into people we don't like, drink too much, embarrass ourselves, or end up getting into a fight. Fear determines what team we root for, because going against the local majority's choice will get us harassed often and possibly physically assaulted from time to time. It chooses our careers for us, because we need a decent job to pay the bills and avoid stinking to death while sleeping on a different curb every night.

Nations exist because of one people's fear of others. Governments can only govern thanks to the fear the police causes in their own populations. Diplomacy is based on how much one country fears another one's armed forces. Wars are fought because a state fears it will eventually be defeated unless it strikes first. Nuclear weapons are mass-produced because one nation fears a second one's capacity to do the same.

Fear doesn't come into play only when we try to avoid suffering, but also when we decide what we actually *want* to do. Whenever we are not busy doing what others want us to or ailing, thus being free to choose an activity, we fear making the wrong choice. We fear we might waste the rare opportunity we found to briefly live a little. We fear we might not enjoy our chosen pastime as much as we hope to. We fear our free time might be better spent doing something unpleasant but profitable. We fear drinking that so-longed-for pack of beer will give us a hangover. We fear the insurance of a car we want to buy might be too expensive. We fear purchasing a new sofa because the dog might chew, pee and crap on it. We fear a movie we intend to watch in the theaters may not be worth the ticket's price. We fear making a mistake, because the time and money we have available to enjoy ourselves are both scarce and fleeting, so we cannot afford to waste either.

Fear is what emanates from our *constant* attempts at avoiding any and all kinds of pain. It materializes as hesitation, doubt, worry, anxiety, dread, panic, terror.

It's not pain itself but the fear of it that stands at the very center of human life's stage, orchestrating every beat we dance to. Fear is what shapes human culture and society; it is the pen that authored our entire history and the one that will keep writing our future for a long time still.

Without fear, we could do what we want, follow what we truly believe in, and endure the necessary pains to do what is right or ultimately collapse under them as we attempt to. With fear, we stop ourselves and cowardly abide by the will of others instead, however wrong they may be, mitigating our own personal suffering while causing even more of it to others.

Human decisions are by no means based on what's right, on what's best. They are based exclusively on what we fear will cause us, individually, the most pain.

Just as a funny story:

A couple of decades ago, the then-oldest woman in my country was interviewed on her 121st birthday. The enthusiastic reporter crouched beside the old lady's wheelchair and said, "Congratulations! How does it feel to be the oldest person in our country?" Struggling, the old lady answered, "It's the worst thing in the world. I wouldn't wish this on anyone."

The funny part is that the interview aired live, so they couldn't censor it. On a Sunday evening, everyone accidentally heard the truth for once.

But why wouldn't the woman kill herself, if her life was "the worst thing in the world?"

Needless to say: fear.

What Drives Us, Part III

At the bottom line, our constant fear of pain and fleeting attempts at pursuing happiness materialize as the most mundane of forces: *money*.

Money buys healthcare treatments, plastic surgeries and (il)legal drugs. It buys food, comfort and entertainment. It mitigates our fears to some extent, being the principal *means* we use to avoid suffering and acquire pleasure.

If we dress expensively and drive a bulletproof BMW, we are respected. If we are stopped by the police while driving such a car, whoever called them for help will end up in jail instead of us even if we are shitfaced and their daughter's blood and brains lie splattered all over our hood. If we hire lawyers, we have rights. If we bribe politicians, we can give ourselves more of those than anyone else has. If we hire a "PR guy," he'll convince people our every flaw is forgivable and our every deed laudable. And if we buy the media, we can make everyone else believe in whatever we want, however absurd it may be.

The contents of the last paragraph require an investment of something between hundreds of thousands and several billions of dollars. But here's the thing: as a rule, we don't *need* any of that. And all the money that's required to afford such expensive things also tends to bring more problems than it solves.

When not in agony, all we require is a place to sleep in safety, food and water (I was going to add "a toilet," but then I remembered there's ground everywhere). Everything else is either superfluous or free. Okay, let's be a little more reasonable: we actually want a *nice* place to live in, some furniture, *more* than enough to eat and drink, a *large* TV, a *fast* computer, to have some savings for eventual emergencies, and perhaps some extra means to entertain ourselves (if the TV and computer are insufficient). Fair enough. But the only thing in there that actually costs a hefty sum is one's home.

You want to travel? Go ahead but, despite some differences, people are still people anywhere you go. Mountains are still mountains, plants are still plants, beaches are still sandy, oceans are still salty, and buildings are still just neatly stacked piles of bricks, wood, steel, glass and/or stone. There's no point in spending a fortune to see the same things with slight variations once you've seen it all once. If there's a place you are particularly fond of, just *move* there.

There's also no place like home, because that's where you are *freer* – that's the only place where you have privacy, where you can be your true self, where you give the orders, where you can walk around naked or take a nap in the middle of the day without paying for or

feeling bad about it. And there's no good enough reason out there for you to abdicate any of that, even if temporarily.

You want a car? Why? You probably don't need to go anywhere far. By now, most of us can work and shop from home. If you want to go out for a beer, invite people over instead and have a drink inside, in safety and comfort. And if you actually want to go somewhere, whenever, for whatever reason, commute. Or even better: ride a bike – it can take you any place you might want to go and helps to keep you in shape while consuming the same fuel you would otherwise flush down the toilet. If you can't stand on two wheels alone, call a cab instead, so that you can temporarily forget your troubles (in other words, “get drunk”) in peace, without putting your life and/or someone else's in danger.

You want women? Turn on your computer, type “porn” in your browser and press “enter.” Pick however many of them you like, out of millions – none will refuse you or cost you a single penny. You won't risk getting any diseases or accidentally creating yet another human being either.

You want love? You can find it online, too. And it's free anyway, since it exists only inside your head.

You want human contact? Make a phone call, Skype, or talk to yourself – it's unlikely you'll find anyone more interesting to talk to.

If you want anything else, most of it is fairly cheap. None of it costs a *billion* dollars. Everything you need, when being reasonable, will hardly amount to a million.

Do you know what rich people used to do in medieval Europe? They bought nice clothes and a ton of spices. They dressed well (in clothes a freezing naked hobo would nowadays refuse to wear) and ate, drank and bathed in the same spices we can now buy for a few bucks in the nearest supermarket or grocery store. Why? Because they had nothing better to do with their lives – there was no *entertainment* available. But now we have plenty of it, enough to keep us distracted for a lifetime. And none of it is too expensive, unless you want to fly your own private jet, sail a yacht or travel into space (in which cases you should seek psychiatric help).

That also explains why actors, professional athletes and the such are paid so much: because once we are healthy and comfortable, all our remaining money is spent on entertaining ourselves. Those people's fortunes do not reflect the actual value of their work, but rather the

fact that all the money the rest of us accumulate has nowhere else to go once our essential needs have been fulfilled. We spend most of what we have to spare on keeping ourselves distracted, because simply being idle and bored is already painful.

That so much money gets siphoned in by the entertainment industry is not *so* bad as it seems, because being amused is not only an “escape from pain” but also part of our “pursuit of happiness” – which means spending it on entertainment also fulfills life’s basic purpose, killing two birds with a single stack of cash. Nonetheless, our entertainers’ fortunes should be much better divided among the people who do the heavy lifting around their productions and presentations, between those who work far more than “stars” do and who actually need that extra money.

Putting things shortly: to enjoy life, all we need is to be *healthy*, *comfortable* and *entertained*, and there are fairly cheap ways to fulfill these three needs.

Having too much money, as previously mentioned, is also a problem in and of itself.

Not only do you not need to be rich but you also don’t want to, because the more money you have the more you have to *worry* about not losing it. The more you had to work (or “suffer”) for it the less inclined you are to spend it. And out of the things you own, the more any of it cost the more you must care about, protect and maintain it.

If you drive an expensive car, you run the risk of being robbed or kidnapped, and if you get a dent on it the repair will cost a small fortune (especially because, seeing your Mercedes, mechanics will extort you). If you walk around wearing fancy clothes and jewelry, you may get shot in the face, in broad daylight, for such items. If you own many assets, you become more legally liable and filing your income tax becomes increasingly complicated and time-consuming. If an economic crisis arises – as they always do – you are more likely to lose a *lot*, and the more you lose the angrier and more anxious you get and for longer you remain so. If you own a business, you have to consider what will become of your employees if you decide to simply shut it down and retire. Knowing you are loaded, people will eventually ask you for loans and you will have to deny them. The poor will envy, hate, and call you “privileged” even though you most likely had to study and work far more than they did to *earn* what you

have (although those who have *the* most are usually also the ones who deserve it the least, thanks to having a cheating talent, being born in the right family, completely lacking scruples, or simply being lucky). Others will hate you because being rich made you unbearably arrogant and condescending. You can't even willingly share your fortune with others, because any decent person would refuse it as not to become indebted to you. And if you accrue enough money to find yourself in a position in which you can in some way influence mankind's destiny, you'll automatically make a lot of enemies, and then you'll have to spend 24/7 trying to protect yourself from them as they'll be constantly trying to destroy you and take what is yours.

We *waste* most of our time making money. Some people ruin one, dozens, thousands, millions or even billions of lives in exchange for a skyscraping pile of cash. Although there are better things out there for us to focus on – for everyone's sake as well as our own – we've developed a mentality and culture that turned us all into simple money-making machines, in detriment of everything that actually matters.

One may argue that a valid reason to have and showcase wealth is to pick up women, as they do seem to love it unconditionally. Feminine beauty is treated as a commodity by women themselves and, unlike men, they like to go out to purchase whatever they run into instead of something specific they need. To many women, restaurants are defined by how much they charge rather than by how their food tastes, and it seems that a lady can never possibly have too many shoes, dresses, purses and jewelry. Then, every couple of years, she needs to find a bigger house to fit those all in. But this is a moot argument for accruing excessive wealth, because no one *wants* a gold-digger. (Call me misogynistic if you will, but women's minds *are* flawed – just as a man's is, except differently.)

The only actually good reason to have a lot of money is to have your rights respected (to hire a decent lawyer and pay for appeals). An actual *fortune* is only “necessary” if what you want is, instead, to *violate* other people's.

If you want to be rich just for the sake of it, that's because our society has “brainsoiled” (because “brainwashed” didn't sound right) you. Like everyone else, including me, you were sociologically infected with a disease when you were little more than a toddler, and that disease is called “greed.”

Whoever you are, I'm sure you can do better than to aim to become an ostentatious, arrogant prick who dedicates their entire life to not losing everything that they have and don't need. Instead of seeking to make a fortune just because you were induced to, use your tradable skills to make *enough* of it, invest what you earned, retire, and go live before you are too old to do so (unless you like what you to do, in which case you have a paid hobby and not a job).

And by the way, "too old" means 30.

Nothing More Than Feelings

We have feelings and emotions. The first ones, in my own definition, relate to *anything* we feel (sensory stimuli included), while the second are *mental* (pun intended for the jolly British audience).

Let's talk about our general feelings first.

To us, the *only* thing that matters in life is how we feel. If something feels good, we seek it; if it feels bad, we avoid it. And we use any and all means available to us to achieve either end. Albeit extremely basic and simple, this is what justifies everything any of us ever did or ever will do. Human beings are really no more complicated than that.

Right and wrong have little to do with our decision-making processes. We don't care about what is right unless doing it makes us feel good; if what is wrong has that effect instead, this is what we go for. If what is right makes us feel bad, we avoid it; if what is wrong does so, then this is what we run from.

Why do so many people use drugs, in such large quantities and so often? Because it makes them feel better. Drugs are bad for us in the long term and they often have bad short-term consequences as well. It's not smart to use them, they give us a hell of a hangover just a few hours after consumption, and we regret many things we do while high for the rest of our lives. And yet we keep on drinking, snorting, smoking and shooting anything that doesn't immediately kills us. It's illogical, but it makes us feel good for a *little while* and, to a human mind, that's enough to "justify" all of its overwhelming downsides.

As I've said before, to be a good person all we have to do is try to do what is right. But to effectively and consistently do so, we need to feel good about it – we must be rewarded in the only way that matters to us for doing what we should and punished in the same way for doing what we shouldn't. But in practice, the opposite of that happens: doing wrong is *far* more beneficial to us. It's beneficial to the individual, in detriment of everyone else. It rewards the selfish, greedy, ambitious, sociopathic and sadistic person not only with power over others and material gain, but the very action of harming others, whenever we do it on purpose, also releases a tsunami of dopamine and other such substances into our brains and bloodstreams. Meanwhile, helping someone else rewards us with only a slight sense of righteousness and nothing else.

We should try teaching ourselves how to feel better about doing better. Some of us behave more civically than others because we *know* why we should – simply *understanding* the ramifications of helping people versus those of hindering them, as I have previously defended and continue to, makes it so that we are rewarded with more than just a “slight sense of righteousness” for doing what is right. As a simplistic and rather direct example, knowing that by rescuing a child from a burning car you not only saved their life but also spared their whole family from a lot of grieving *does* make you feel better than you would by having saved just the child's life. And comprehending that *every* good deed has numerous positive consequences has the same effect.

But maybe that teaching is not strictly necessary or, perhaps, not quite as I just suggested. Looking back as an old man, I regret the times I was an asshole to people and I'm proud of the few times I risked myself in someone else's favor while having nothing to gain from it. In hindsight, we rue doing wrong and feel glad about doing right. And such memories haunt us until we die.

One problem with the above is that we only feel regret or pride *after* the fact, thus not *causing* us to take action. But a bigger issue is that some people simply don't feel like I do; that some human brains apparently don't work as mine does. If they all did, who knows? Maybe that would be enough.

Perhaps one day we'll be able to alter the human genome to make our brains reward us better for doing what we should and punish us harder for doing what we shouldn't. Then, we'll all have good enough incentives to strive to be righteous. Naturally, artificially,

intellectually, culturally, socially, chemically and/or surgically, this *can* be done.

Until that day comes, though, the best we can do may be to understand the basic principles I've mentioned earlier in this text and try to incorporate them in our lives and actions as best as we can.

Now, let's talk about *emotions* and how they ruin everything.

We all know Mr. Spock, many have watched *Equilibrium*, some have read *Brave New World*, and I'm confident more works must have addressed the same subject: emotions are a *problem*. I'm just one among many who thinks so.

When someone pisses us off, it doesn't matter if we try to keep cool and rationally assess the situation. It doesn't matter if we are wrong and the other person is right. We forget everything we believe in, all we claim to stand up for, and just punch them in the face before we even realize our arm has moved.

There's no problem in feeling the touch of something, the smell, the taste. These are useful sensations, they can be pleasant and, most importantly, they seem to be enough. Emotions, meanwhile, are *toxic*. Like others before me, I fail to see what constructive purpose they serve, and I wonder why evolution cursed us with them.

We don't need to *love* a person. Having an orgasm is reward enough to justify sex, leading to reproduction and the perpetuation of our species.

We don't need to *hate* someone. Knowing we'll have less food, a worse shelter, or for any reason less chances of survival due to a certain animal or person is enough to justify killing them (at least from the usual, narrow-sighted perspective).

We don't need to *fear* something. When we see a lion charging at us, we know we'd better run thanks to the severe pain, maiming, and death that will most likely ensue if we don't.

Our senses and basic neurochemical rewards seem to be enough to keep us alive and moving forward. Emotions are a second, over-exaggerated layer of incentive that causes a lot more problems than they solve, if they ever solve any. They seem to be *superfluous*.

So why the hell do we have them?

I recently read something on the subject and learned that, at least up until thirty years ago, no one had figured out the purpose of human emotions. I couldn't find any more up-to-date information, but it seems fair to assume that to the academic circle they still remain an evolutionary mystery. After giving it some thought, though, I came up with a possible explanation for their existence.

Emotions may be a tool of chaos and desperation, a mechanism to *bypass* or *reinforce* our core programming. Depending on the circumstances, they may strengthen our most primitive instincts or force us to ignore them, potentially leading us to forfeit all sense of self-preservation, even to the point of sacrificing ourselves.

Let's test this theory against real emotions in [somewhat] concrete scenarios.

Why do you fear?

You can assess the situation logically, and you are also programmed to fly or fight. You fear because you know you are not capable of facing the challenge before you. If you try, you'll most likely fail and suffer as a consequence. You want to tackle it, but you are inept. And if you flee, a lower self-esteem will relentlessly follow. The ivory pedestal you arbitrarily put yourself upon will shatter, and the fall might be fatal to your ego. The odds are you'll die if you face what looms ahead. You should run and you know it, but you are too proud. You may even become stuck, knowing not what to do - is it worse to die proudly, or to live in shame? Something needs to push you in one direction or the other, and with such force that nothing you may come up with in your feeble mind will be able to stop it - *fear*.

In panic, you dart away. You survive, while becoming a notorious coward. People no longer fear you - at all - so they start mocking and attacking you on every opportunity they get. And then one day, just for fun, they murder you.

Why do you love?

You have found the perfect mate, the girl of your dreams. You are irresistibly drawn to her, like a babe to a teat (or even better: two). She drives you literally crazy, and you don't want anything else in the world. Why? Because she's nice to look at. Her smile and voice are heartwarming. Deep down inside, part of you also deemed her genetically worthy. And the two of you get along, which should make

your life more pleasant and raising children easier. That girl is the one and none other matters. You won't be happy without her, and sowing your seed elsewhere would not yield the best crop. Yet you know your chances are much higher with other women. You can easily reproduce, but not to your complete satisfaction. Something must drive you towards the best possible outcome, ignoring the high odds of failure, all the negativity that may follow rejection, and also any impulse to reproduce without criteria. Thus, you *love*.

You shoot for perfection even though the entire universe screams you shouldn't. You end up making a fool of yourself – the love of your life stomps your heart, mocks your efforts, spits on your face and walks away. A couple of days later, the soul-crushing depression that inevitably ensues from such an irrecoverable failure leads you to take your own life.

Why do you hate?

Someone wronged you, and justice must be done if we are to survive. If *you* are to survive. Not only is it the right thing to do, but also something you want. And if you cannot avenge yourself, you are weak. You cannot be weak, because then the rest of your tribe would rape you without a condom and grow a monstrous fetus inside your intestines – one that births through the chest, like an Alien. But the guy who took a dump inside your neat tent for a laugh is twice your size. Honestly, you don't stand a chance. But if you forfeit vengeance, others will do the same thing to you again, and again, and again. Your home will be known as "the sty," becoming your tribe's one and only official public toilet. The children will dub you "Mr. Piggy" even though none of the crap inside your tent will actually be yours. Thus, something must push you towards necessary violence, towards vengeance, towards justice. Something you cannot fight, something stronger than surviving simply for surviving – *hatred*.

Raging, you charge the guy who soiled your personal haven, from behind, with a flimsy stone-tipped spear in your hands. You thrust with all your might, plus the adrenaline bonus. Being uniquely clumsy, you trip and miss your target by a whole meter.

Now, your tribe has *two* reasons to laugh at you, and they'll never forget either. Even babies now look sardonic – you can swear their random smiles and laughter are all directed at you. That anger you initially felt towards one you now feel towards all. They are too many to kill – especially for someone who failed to kill a single one with a

stab in the back – and the look on each of their faces is a constant reminder of your failure.

Humiliated, you abandon your tribe and brave the wilds alone, decided to become a one-with-nature hermit. But you can't find an adequate source of water, of food, or build a proper shelter on your own. You quickly contract a mysterious disease, leading to dysentery and death by dehydration before a single week has passed.

Why do you envy?

You want something. Others have it but you don't, because you can't. You are incompetent, incapable, useless and undeserving. Roland Strongshield is better. What the hell can you do? Nothing. But you are sick of feeling inferior, so... you cheat – you decide to achieve what you want by any means necessary. Like a puppet you are moved, by *envy*.

In the middle of the night, you steal Roland's horse and make a run for it. Now, Dorothy is yours. You can ride her as much as you want and live happily ever after. Until you get caught, that is – and on the very next morning, you are. Then, if the peasants of your village don't pitchfork you to death, there's a good chance that regret will lead to your demise instead, since you are worse off now than you were when you started.

I reiterate: emotions seem to be a tool of *chaos*. They are messy, their workings are ugly, and they often contradict themselves: love may allow one to overcome fear, or the exact opposite can happen.

I hypothesize that emotions arise from our “advanced” consciousness. At some point, our thoughts became capable to exert enough influence over us to, if not wholly, at least in part overcome our basic instincts. For a while now we have no longer been guided exclusively by the latter but also greatly by our own conscious assessment of ourselves and our environment. Instincts may have found their match in our intellect and, in a tie, they could lock us into inaction. New brain structures and an overwhelming surge of neurochemicals had to be implemented to keep us moving without [permanently] depriving us from the basic survival systems we had previously developed.

Although emotions continue to drive us literally insane, leading to an enormous amount of problems and possibly giving birth to every major catastrophe in human history, that could be the practical purpose they serve.

Be Lucky or Be Gone

Remember when you wouldn't study for any tests in school and yet you did better than all the other kids? How you could throw a ball farther than anyone else without doing anything differently? The way you kept running while the other wheezing, breathless children dropped to the ground all around you? How about never having even tried to pick up women, because they've always thrown themselves at you? Do you know that thing you attempted for the very first time and it worked flawlessly, whereas it always fails for everyone else?

No?

Then you never stood a chance.

Every person who is good at something is so not because they worked harder, not because they deserve it more, but because they are more *talented*.

Talent is something we are born with. It's something our brain does automatically for us or our genes facilitate. It's blind luck - we don't choose it, we don't earn it, we don't understand it, and by no means do we deserve it (hence why "talented" and "gifted" are interchangeable). *Effort*, on the other hand, is all the extra crap we have to endure when we don't have a talent, just to reap far worse results.

Merit - which I would define as "the amount of suffering one has to withstand in pursuit of an objective" - comes from effort; success comes from talent. And people tend to mix those things up as if the two of them walked hand-in-hand. More often than not, they don't.

Take Andre The Giant - a man born with acromegaly (a disorder that causes an excessive production of the growth hormone) - at a young age, and another boy whose muscles don't properly synthesize proteins, both dreaming to be the world's strongest man. The first can push a car sideways with his bare hands at the age of 10 (rough guess) without having ever done *any* actual physical training or work. The second spends the next twenty five years of his life going to the gym and lifting as much weight as he can, an hour and a half a day, six days a week and, at his peak, manages to weigh impressive 65 kilograms and bench-press the same.

Watch a tennis match between a tall player and a short one. One screams sweat and blood throughout the entire game; the other wins. You hear one of their names everywhere, while no one knows the other guy's. Guess which one is which.

Let's say an American guy wants to "defend" his country so that people will publicly thank him for his service. But he wants to make things happen, to see constant action and make a real difference, so he decides to join the NSA instead of the Army (no one is going to thank him for this, but that's okay). He studies hard since a young age, is called a "nerd" and bullied on a daily basis, manages to get into the MIT, attends his college classes diligently, and spends five years studying computer and software engineering, fourteen hours a day, seven days a week, under some of the top experts in the field (by himself after classes, during weekends and breaks). Finally, after graduating *summa cum laude*, he applies for a job in the Agency. But he doesn't make the cut. No - only Caltech folks who know everything before ever learning any of it get hired. Our guy ends up moderating a math forum for kids on the internet. Meanwhile, self-taught, high-IQ Snowden got into the agency without even going to college and became *the* Snowden. And he hooked up with a hot chick somehow, while our MIT guy routinely contributes to increasing Pornhub's daily traffic.

Picture this: a young girl who dreams about being in the movies. She starts taking theater classes during school years. Before long, she's making presentations before her peers on commemorative occasions, just to be laughed at despite her best dramatic efforts. Our girl goes to college and double-majors in acting and filmmaking, dedicating every second of her waking life to her beloved craft, learning everything there is to be known about it. She knows her Chekovs, Millers and Molières forward and backward, and finally starts acting professionally, playing support roles in theater plays. Her entire life was dedicated to each and every one of her performances, and it *does* show. She's good, and she has earned her place under the spotlight. But then comes along Gal Gadot. Gal doesn't know the first thing about acting, but she's pretty and knows people in the movie industry, so she gets the part that our poor, real actress also auditioned for - and not just one, but all of them. Gal gets paid millions of dollars just to be herself in front of a camera, while our dedicated girl struggles to make ends meet and never manages to find her way into the big screen.

We also have Denzel Washington's son (I always forget the kid's name), who is as wooden as a urinated cat-pole and yet got cast to fill major roles in multiple large-budget movies, including a leading one in *Tenet* – a movie he completely ruined, and one in which Robert Pattinson (an actual actor, despite his supposedly good looks) was embarrassingly forced to support him. And all exclusively thanks to daddy's influence (which is not a talent per se, but a matter of sheer undeserved luck all the same).

As a completely off-topic side note, just not to miss the opportunity as I am currently talking about specific actors: *Michael Caine* (you know, the guy who, among many other roles, portrayed Albert in Christopher Nolan's Batman trilogy). Look at the stage name he chose: *My Cocaine*. The man completely mocked his own craft and career as well as everyone else who's a part of it and, still, somehow he made it. I checked it and "Michael Caine" has nothing to do with his real name (Maurice Joseph Micklewhite). He chose that alias on purpose. If he had to do it all over again, at this day and age, he'd probably dub himself "Fukk Yall."

Back on topic: I'm not saying successful, talented people are necessarily undeserving. The very best results, of course, come from talented people who *also* put real effort into their work – almost as much as those without talent do. I say "almost" because, once one succeeds, they stop trying, training and practicing, since attempting to improve something that has already been perfected is pointless. They stop pushing themselves, whereas those who are not talented keep failing and thus must keep trying, and trying harder, until they eventually give up without ever achieving anything. And given that people often preach one should never give up (which is an absolute idiocy), untalented folks always end up putting *far* more effort into what they [try to] do.

You might question what I said above on the basis that "some people don't try hard enough." If an untalented person puts a lot of effort into something while a talented one puts none, the first may actually end up surpassing the second. Yes, it's possible. But the very willpower one needs to try and keep trying, to ignore their failures and overcome their limitations, *is* a talent. No one gets to choose how much they want something, how much they can endure, or to be stupid enough to believe something impossible isn't (which is required to attempt and then insist on it).

If someone is born with an extraordinarily strong will while another person is born being capable of, let's say, instinctively and precisely measuring the strength and direction of the wind, and they both decide to become archers, it's possible the second person will give up after just a few disappointing failures while the first will keep going even after failing a thousand times more and, eventually, this one may become better than the other. It can happen, it does, and it's a matter of talent just the same.

Will alone is no match against specific, full-blown cheating talents, though. No matter how many decades you spend "mnemonicing" paragraphs of text, you'll never get close to the performance of someone who has a photographic memory (Wikipedia states this is a myth, but Dame Judy Dench claims the opposite. I saw her saying, in an interview, that she had such a memory, lost it once she reached an advanced age, and consequently can no longer portray more complicated roles on stage).

The amount of work a person with a talent needs to dedicate towards something automatically done by their brain or genes is always, by definition, much lower. If it isn't, they don't have a talent.

"Practice makes perfect" is a fallacy - talent plus directed training (no coach necessary) makes so. If you want to be truly good at something, find out if you have an *edge* for it first. Only then should you put some heavy, deliberate effort into it. If you don't have a natural advantage, find a way to want something else. Don't waste hours, weeks, years or decades of your life trying to do something that others can do better than you ever will in just a few minutes. Also, *do* give up as soon as you realize an endeavor is pointless or otherwise not worth doing.

Good *luck*!

Oh! And always root for the underdog as well - if he made it far enough for you to know he exists, he's probably the one who *deserves* to win.

We, The Braves

Fair warning: this is where things start to get "offensive" or, in other words, where the truth starts to become unpleasant.

We, humans, are a proud species. Why? I have no idea. But when anyone tries to dispel our holier-than-thou, made-in-God's-image

illusion they end up being crucified. And yet we need to see ourselves for what we are, and someone must say the things I'm about to, because we can't even *try* to fix something that is broken while we keep fooling ourselves into believing it's not.

So let's get started.

Dare a skinny nerd to spit on an NFL offensive liner's face. Or ask this one to go alone against another team's entire defensive line in a bar brawl. Put them all together and tell them to take down an old, retired police officer holding a loaded pistol. None of them is going to do any of that, even if they had every possible reason and right to do so. Why?

Because *every human being is a coward*.

Unless we have a clear advantage – be it weight, height, speed, some skill or, above all, we are part of a larger group – we'll usually have [some] manners, behave [almost] properly, and act like a [minimally] decent person. When we *do* have an edge, we are inclined to do the opposite.

Some people are just cretins who are willing to hurt any number of others so long as they profit from it. Others are frustrated and angry with something that happened to them and need to unleash that frustration on someone else. Few do not fall into at least one of those two categories. And as most of us seek to make ourselves feel better at someone else's expense (because this *does* make us feel better), whenever we run into a person who seems like an easy prey we hardly ever let slide the opportunity to bully them. Our victim's innocence is, in practice, entirely irrelevant to us.

Being in a larger group against a smaller one is the “worst” (from the opposite perspective, the best) of all advantages we may have because, in this situation, if we mess up, we expect someone else on our side will come to our aid and fix everything. If things go south, there's a good chance that someone other than us will pay for it. And if our “team” beats the other, even if we didn't do anything we still bask in “our” victorious glory.

When being part of a larger group we also always try to *impress* its other members. We do things that even when having some other advantage we usually wouldn't. To increase our personal standing among our peers we might, for instance, beat up a man we could instead have simply argued with. Or steal something instead of bitching about the price and asking for a discount. Or drink far more

than we should, throw up, and then continue drinking. We do stupid things to inspire some level of fear or admiration in the people surrounding us because both of those things translate into respect, and respect translates into *personal safety*. The more we harm others or otherwise prove we are “better” (hardly ever in a good way) than them, the less those who witness such actions are inclined to harm *us* in the future. (Social psychology has even coined terms for the attitude that derives from one being part of a group, such as “groupthink” and “deindividuation.” You can look those up if you want to read what experts have to say about this particular phenomenon.)

Circling back to our lack of courage: when in a *disadvantage*, the best we can do is to get drunk, blow some coke or smoke crack, because then we are not quite ourselves – some of the neurological devices that define us are temporarily altered or disabled, allowing us to do what no sober person dares. Alas, in such circumstances we are considered stupid instead of valiant. But fairly so, because “to be brave” and “to be stupid” are synonyms.

As I once saw written on a wall, “A hero is one who didn’t have time to run.”

Genghis Khan wouldn’t have killed hundreds or thousands of men if he wasn’t an extraordinarily *talented* warrior who had an entire army behind him (an army that had as its top priority keeping him from being blindsided or overwhelmed).

The Spartans of the Battle of Thermopylae were not the men of legends, or at least not as we like to imagine them. They were 7,000 Greeks in total, not 300; they fought between 120,000 and 300,000 Persians, not a million; out of the 2,300 of them who stayed behind to cover the main Greek army’s retreat, some 400 surrendered; they fought because they had no choice; they only temporarily succeeded, for a couple of days, because they had a *very* strong tactical upper hand; and those who died in their last stand only did so because they had nowhere to run.

Edward Snowden wouldn’t have blown the whistle on NSA’s omni-spying if he didn’t have a place to flee to, a plan for how to get there, and help from others to actually do so.

Alexey Navalny wouldn’t have been poisoned multiple times, starved, tortured, frozen and killed in a Siberian prison for defending his

ideals if he wasn't naive enough to believe Putin wouldn't "dare" to do all of that to him.

And Vladimir Vladimirovich himself would be selling hot-dogs instead of murdering hundreds of thousands of people, just like that Wagner Company guy he assassinated used to, if the FSB didn't have his back.

We never pick a fight we don't *expect* to win because doing so is suicide. We are programmed to fight or fly and usually more than smart enough to know when the odds are stacked against us. And we naturally (read "automatically") stick to our basic programming and by the obvious.

The best we can accomplish is to do something that *seems* courageous (but isn't).

Many people are too stupid to foresee and/or fully comprehend the potentially dire consequences of their actions, so they dare out of sheer ignorance. Some feel less pain than the rest of us, so they dare because the consequences, for them, are not as bad. Others dare because they are even more afraid of *not* doing so - they are particularly terrified of being considered as much of a coward as they, like everyone else, in fact are.

So don't feel bad when fear makes you refrain from doing something. Even if most people do it and you are the exception, you are no more of a coward than any them. You are just better aware of the risks involved, of the potential consequences, and of what these mean to *you* (which is different from what it means to any other person).

You are not worse - you are just as bad as everyone else. And probably smarter.

We, The Nobles

Courage isn't the only virtue we lack. We are also dishonest, unkind, and we have no honor. In general, we lack intelligence, wisdom, humility, integrity, compassion, civility, decency, ethics, professionalism and manners.

We have a strong tendency to flatter ourselves. We all want and try our best to believe we are better than we really are because we need to feel special, non-mediocre. But if we need to *believe* we are better, it's because we *know* we are not good enough.

We don't do anything that is not in our own selfish benefit. We are guided by survival instincts and personal interests, rarely by reason and never by virtue. We couldn't possibly care less about people we don't know, regardless of what unimaginable ill befalls however many of them.

Throughout countless years of prehistory, we did our best to weed out those who were useless to our tribes and clans. It made sense, it was logical, and it had to be done for us to survive. Nowadays, though, it's not so easy to tell who has use to us or not, because most of the things we all own and eat were invented, made, or grown by people we don't know and never will. Other than those closest to us, no one else *seems* to have any value. And we are still programmed to think the same way we did in ancient times.

If, for instance, you murder a farmer, your food will come from another and be there at the grocery store readily waiting for you just the same. The man you killed is completely irrelevant – to you, his death is no loss at all.

Think about those times when you helped someone (if it ever happened). Did you do so out of kindness? Or perhaps to bargain for a favor in the future? To influence how others perceive you? To feel better about yourself?

Are you more interested in loving or in *being* loved? Is the second even relevant if not for the reciprocal effects it has on the first?

Is it how others feel about you that matters, or how *you* feel about how they feel about you?

Answer those questions.

Are you sure? Or are you lying to yourself?

Altruism is pretty much a myth. There may be some rare exceptions (none comes to mind) but, in the vast majority of cases, we help people *exclusively* to benefit ourselves, to feel better or otherwise advance our own cause. Interacting positively with others releases oxytocin in our brains, making us high. Helping someone while under public scrutiny makes us look like decent people, and we look

preemptively forward to the social rewards we expect to arise from that forged impression (this is called “performative altruism”).

There are no knights in shining armor among us. We just throw some colorful, poorly-knitted tabards over our blood-splattered, Chinese-made aluminum breastplates hoping to fool ourselves and everyone else, because we cannot accept our limitations, the flaws of our society, the truth of what we are and of what we have accomplished as individuals and as a species. We act and speak proudly just to hide our inner shame.

I painted a somewhat grim picture of ourselves, but the fact is it doesn't matter for what reason we do something good, so long as we do it. Even if motivated exclusively by personal gains, helping others is still helping. However selfish the cause may be, its consequences are still positive. Just don't feel smug about it because, if you ever aid someone else, there'll probably be nothing noble about your motivations and, in any case, you'll only be doing what you *should* do.

Funny story: I was recently talking to a girl – one of those who literally undergo a series of plastic surgeries just to look better on Instagram photos – and at a certain point she said, “I do some voluntary work every now and then.” As I began to roll my eyes, she added, “But I do it because it makes *me* feel better.”

Against all odds and overwhelming evidence to the contrary, maybe there's still hope for these latest human (de)generations. It seems a few of them are not entirely retarded (that girl was a Millennial though; not a Gen Z or newer model).

Them, The Princesses

One of our major goals in life is to get sex. That's what we pursue when we are temporarily rid of any pain and what most people ultimately purchase with all the money they make. I will go ahead and throw the emotional side dish (being loved, socially accepted,

the fear of dying alone, etc.) in there too so as not to ignore our psychological issues.

Until we are 30 or so, we are pretty much blind to anything other than dating. Many remain oblivious to everything else that comprises our universe until they die of old age. And this narrow focus on romantic relationships and sexual activities creates problems, because it hinders us uninterested in things that are *actually* interesting, directing most of our efforts towards a goal that is not only useless but in fact destructive, as it can lead to men fighting over women, to people murdering their cheating spouses, to children being born, etc.

One all-encompassing sociological consequence of our sexual overdrive is that women, albeit unknowingly, control our species – men rule over the whole planet, but we are ruled ourselves by women. The fact that they are indirectly in charge, in itself, is no big deal. The real problem is that women are *far more attracted* to aggressive, dishonest, sly and/or arrogant scumbags than to smart, educated, humble and/or well-mannered gents.

When we hurt or humiliate someone, not only do we get testosterone and dopamine boosts and social respect (out of fear), but also the big prize: the ladies. And this makes it so that, instead of behaving civically and constructively as we should, we deliberately behave animalistically and destructively, because this pays much better in the ways we are programmed to appreciate the most.

Take a look at professional athletes and their behavior, at the attitude, arrogance and general disrespect that comes from being *physically* more apt than most and making a fortune out of doing something useless that everyone else does for fun, while getting daily public praise from irresponsible people who profit from broadcasting their usually unmerited talents in pointless action. Then see how much a Nobel Prize winner makes, how he talks and behaves, and how much attention he gets in comparison. Guess which one gets the girl.

I suspect the true source of this problem is primitive and very deeply seated: women's preferences probably stem from them being no match for men in physical confrontations, so they have an existential need to be protected by someone who is able to defend them from the largest possible number of [mostly man-born] threats. But this can and should be changed.

If we started publicly praising those who actually help our species instead of those who hold it back, showcasing good-natured political, social and scientific accomplishments every day, everywhere, and praising the people behind them instead of those who dedicate themselves to useless physical endeavors, women would be much more interested in and inclined to admire those among us who actually deserve admiration. To allow for their mating standards to evolve we must also make our world safer, so that women don't *need* to bed a Pit Bull to feel secure. And by simply stopping to encourage senseless violent activities, the competitive and aggressive mindset they foster and the destructive behavior they lead to, we might achieve this result.

If female preferences change, this alone should greatly improve our society and global quality of life, because the most sought-after prize would go to those who contribute to our betterment instead of those who jeopardize it. With some *ethical* social engineering (in the original sense of the expression), women could willingly reward the human instead of the animal, the intellect instead of the instinct, peace instead of war, life instead of death. They could be "used" (in a good way) to forge a brighter future instead of one potentially even darker than the present. Our governments, media and filmmakers should try herding us all in this direction instead of encouraging disputes, incompetence, slyness, victimization, homosexuality, criminal behavior, etc.

In any case, the times they are a-changin'. With the number/percentage of women who now seem to be okay with making a living by exposing their naked bodies on the internet, on-demand AI pornography, plus technological advancements and other factors that have been leading people to stay at home rather than going out, to text instead of talk and to watch instead of do, *direct* sexual relations seem bound to become virtually obsolete in the near future.

For better or worse, the paradigm is shifting. And it's probably for the better, since it's hard to imagine things getting any worse.

Evil Always Wins

You already know what I'm about to say, but bear with me for after the next few paragraphs I'll go a little deeper into it.

As far as humans are concerned, whoever ignores the rules the most wins. Those unshackled by moral principles – “the most evil” – always have a huge advantage over those who are, or at least try to be, ethical.

I have previously defined “to be good” essentially as “not to harm others.” And that can also be phrased as “not to violate anyone else’s rights.” To be evil, then, could be defined as “to disrespect that which others are entitled to” – to kill (life), steal (property), humiliate (dignity), spy (privacy), etc. So it’s simple: do not do unto others what you do not want done to thine self, and you are good (pun intended). The Bible and preschool got this much right.

Though I disagree with many of our laws, by now the majority of [Western] nations seem to have gotten most of the basics (fundamental rights) correctly. Things can get much more complicated in infra-constitutional laws (which deal with specific or exceptional cases) and legislators all over the world have completely messed these ones up. If we had *ideal* laws in place, “to be good” would coincide with “not to be a criminal” (almost, actually, thanks to the “helping others” aspect of “right,” as I defined it earlier). That must have been the goal, but we’ve always lacked the reasoning, honest intentions, and the qualified voters, representatives and leaders necessary to reach it.

I veered a bit off-topic there, so let’s get back to it: *good has constraints; evil doesn’t.*

If we try to resolve an impasse based on morality and legality, we are bound to and our actions limited by them. There’s only so much we *can* do, as there are lines we refuse or are not allowed to cross. If we disregard legal consequences and our ethics (or simply have none), though, we can just kill someone and/or take their possessions for ourselves, even causing massive collateral damage to many other people so that we, *alone*, can benefit.

Bound by our own morality, we don’t do something we *could* because we know it’s wrong; because we don’t want to. Bound by laws, we don’t do something we *should* because we are afraid of the consequences – we are not willing to jeopardize all we’ve honestly built throughout our lives to do this one thing, even if it’s right (but illegal). Meanwhile, those unbound by moral or legal chains can do anything, because they don’t care about the victim(s) at all, they have a fairly good chance of escaping punishment (especially if they are part of the government – a president, a senator, a soldier, a

police officer, etc.), and they know that committing one crime or a thousand is pretty much the same, since they have to avoid being caught either way, which means that, after the first crime is committed, a criminal is pretty much free to perpetrate as many others as they want.

Mostly, we don't punish people who should be punished, we don't persecute those who should be persecuted, and we don't kill those who should be killed because we have no physical means to do it ourselves. Sometimes, we don't do it because our misguided laws do not allow us to – we'd be severely punished for doing what is right or the law itself prescribes an unfair punishment for a criminal action (meaning neither us nor our judiciary systems are allowed to make *actual* justice). And other times, we don't do what we should because we *believe* it would be wrong – even though it wouldn't – thanks to the miseducation we received from our parents, teachers and society, from priests, the movies and the media. In the scant few cases remaining, justice is served and human life is improved.

Okay. That was the part you already knew, which I just mentioned because it would be wrong not to.

Now, let's move on to some less obvious things about evil's freedom and good's bondage.

For starters, this issue is not our doing – evil's advantages are a natural consequence of how our universe works. We cannot feel what other people feel, think their thoughts, move their bodies. If they get hurt, suffer or die, we don't. Thus we don't care about anyone other than ourselves, because nothing *compels* us to.

As despicable as many of our selfish actions are, from a narrow-sighted perspective (one disregarding what I said in Chapter I) they are logical. Primitive, organic, individual life does benefit from selfishness. The universe causes this problem on its own. Our role, as sentient beings, is to *fix* it.

Secondly, the extensive collective damage we cause by acting egotistically is not the only downside of doing so, because human selfishness is also *contagious*. It spreads and corrupts other people, potentially encompassing a whole population or even our entire species. If one person, entity or party amid an ethically-working system decides to go off-rails and desecrate our [somewhat] civilized standards, every other player involved is *forced* to do the same,

otherwise, having their hands tied to their backs (by laws and moral principles), they are bound to be defeated. And with the “fair players” gone, the worst of all – the one who *chose* to set everything on fire – wins and quickly achieves absolute control.

On top of that, even if no one has ruined a certain thing yet – business practices, policies, the truth, whatever – someone inevitably will, sooner rather than later. Knowing our peers, we must *assume* so. And then, based on that reasonable assumption, we decide to cheat ourselves, *preemptively*, just to stay in the game. Otherwise those who can never be allowed to win emerge victorious once again.

Let me give you a couple of concrete examples:

Have you ever seen Coca-Cola advertising how its products rot the consumers’ teeth, how they damage our stomachs and possibly other parts of our bodies? Of course not. They “casually omit” those facts. They make hundreds of millions of human lives worse so that they can profit from it. If they didn’t, you would be healthier, but they would be poorer. And no one gives a damn about you other than yourself, least of all those who make a fortune out of your misery.

If a soda company were to be candid with its consumers, it would either shut down and stop producing its poison on its own or, due to honest advertisement, go bankrupt. And if Coca-Cola does its best to fool you, so *must* Pepsi, otherwise you would never have even heard about this one because, with all the money in its pockets and no moral restraints in its board of directors, Coke would have drank Pepsi out of existence a long time ago. It would then have become a monopoly that annually spends billions of dollars in biased researches, lobbying and bribing, zero on quality assurance and customer service, and no one would ever again be able to stop Coke from injecting whatever it wanted into our bodies.

As a second example: up until a few centuries ago, Europe’s diplomacy was based on moral principles. *Religious* ones, to be more accurate (which, morally, are highly questionable). Then came Cardinal Richelieu and his *raison d’État*.

Richelieu was the first to decide that, to empower his France, *anything* was acceptable. “Raison d’État” essentially means that a state deems itself entitled to do whatever it wants to improve its own standing, regardless of the means used or of how much damage is caused to any other. It’s the official adoption of human egotism as a foreign affairs policy.

France then began expanding and, through senseless murder, easily stole a hefty chunk of Europe for itself (as was pretty common in medieval Europe. I'm not saying France was the only greedy and violent party involved). Within one century, *every* other European state had, logically, adopted the same doctrine to be able to compete against France and survive. And to this very day morality was never heard of in diplomacy again.

Pepsi and Europe-minus-France were both *forced* to adopt unethical conducts to be able to fend off their competitors once Coke and France started doing so (I don't know if Coke was actually the first among soda companies; that was an uneducated guess). If they hadn't, they would have perished.

When people are naturally encouraged to be selfish and those who refuse to act this way not only don't oppose those who do, or simply do nothing, but instead are forced to *imitate* them, we find ourselves trapped in a self-destructive vicious circle: more and more people start acting more and more selfishly, until no one is left who's willing, or even remembers how, to act otherwise.

This "corruption's contagion" issue is a major one not only on its own, but also because it creates another problem: it makes it hard for us to tell who is downright evil and who simply acted so, perhaps just once but still deliberately, in an attempt to stop the first one from achieving total domination (which is something we *are* supposed and morally entitled to do).

The only solution I can see to this issue is for us to quickly detect those who are, in fact, extraordinarily greedy and sociopathic and *kill* them before they directly or indirectly corrupt everyone else. Otherwise, it becomes impossible to identify and separate the two groups of people mentioned in the previous paragraph, who must be dealt with very differently if we are to treat them fairly. This may be the only way to prevent the erosion of the moral and legal principles that allow human society to exist; to prevent acts that desecrate them from multiplying uncontrollably, becoming the rule instead of the exception, as they currently are.

Dealing with those who seek their own selfish advancement at the cost of massive harm being caused to others as swiftly and harshly as possible should be one of our foremost priorities. "Swiftly" is paramount here not only because if we don't act fast enough havoc is wreaked, but also because once one has destroyed too much they can't possibly be *punished enough* for it (at least not in our current

legal systems) – e.g., once someone has killed *two* [innocent] people, simply killing them back is not enough. If this is all we do to them, they win. Thus, they *must* suffer a fate worse than death. Alas, this ship has already sailed, and towing it back to shore is now infinitely harder than it once was to simply prevent it from lifting anchor. What I just suggested is what our regulatory, judiciary, and law-enforcing institutions should strive for, but these have long been corrupted themselves. Now we have far more people than we can control roaming this Earth, and after seeing so many others doing it, we are all well aware that *cheating* is not only the easiest way to get through life but also a perfectly acceptable one.

Thus, evil wins. And we all lose.

As a parallel thought: while malicious deeds can and often do go unpunished, the vast majority of benevolent ones also tend to go unrewarded.

As I've said before, by doing the right thing one gets a [mild] sense of righteousness instead of a meal, a million dollars, or whatever else they might fancy stealing today. It seems like a bad trade-off when compared to doing what is wrong, and it would indeed be if not for the fact that, if we act decently, humanity's "global score" ends with a positive balance and we *all* benefit from it.

Not only do we get a "lesser" reward for doing what is right but, as the old adage goes, "no good deed goes unpunished." Or as Machiavelli put it (in my own, preferred version of his words in English), "He who abandons what is done for what ought to be done rather brings about his ruin than his preservation, for a man who tries to make a profession of goodness in everything necessarily comes to grief among so many who are not good." That's because we don't just actively cheat, but we also take advantage of people when they "selflessly" do something *for us* as well. Instead of being thankful and humbled, we see good-doers as weak and abuse them. When we help someone else, we learn that doing so is not worth it because things tend to become *worse* for us, since living among narrow-sighted predatory animals we are then considered and treated as fools by our peers. As a consequence, we stop doing what we should continue to.

As Edmund Burke (widely attributed to) once said, "All that is necessary for evil to succeed is that good men do nothing." And

that's exactly what good people do when they learn that doing what is right is in fact harmful to them: nothing. They stand by and watch grimly as the world tears itself to pieces, hoping death will come soon and send them anywhere except back here.

That downside of good-doing means that to do what is right we must *sacrifice ourselves*. To improve things, we who want them to improve must suffer in exchange – we must “take one for the team.” We must accept to lose something, to suffer in stead of others, to expect no reward and, in fact, to be severely punished for it because, given our rotten nature, misguided views and ensuing irrational laws, that's what is going to happen.

Sacrificing oneself sounds terrible and it is just as bad as it sounds. But given the status quo, that's the only way available for us to do what we must and fix the existence we ourselves have ruined. If [many] *more* of us decided to do what we know is right, ignoring criminal laws and greedy imbeciles' self-serving opinions, our sacrifices would become less taxing as things started changing and our general behavior began to improve. And if *enough* of us (the vast majority) ever manage to think and act more selflessly and compassionately, the benefits of doing so will then become obvious, as happening much more often such acts' effects will directly affect all of us. This would make those required sacrifices negligible (we'd no longer be censored, assaulted, kidnapped, tortured and/or murdered for saying/doing what is right) and teach us the opposite of what we have all been taught: that cheating (which includes tricking, scamming, stealing, murdering, etc.) is *not* the way to go.

Think about that example I provided in Chapter I in which you stole an apple from a guy, causing all sorts of problems for him. When acting egotistically, we cause a lot more damage than the material one. But when we act selflessly, we also generate extra benefits. If you stop to help someone change their car's tire, you'll spend time and energy doing so – from your individual perspective, you'll lose both, exchanging them for nothing. But you'll feel good about helping. Maybe not good enough to justify the effort, but it's a start. The person you helped, on the other hand, will have saved themselves the time and energy you spent aiding them, they might be very relieved (in case they didn't even know how to change a tire), and their view of mankind will improve. Everything we have to endure will suddenly make a little more sense to them. Even if only temporarily, our existence won't seem like a hopeless endeavor to the person you aided. And when they get back home, whereas the

guy you stole an apple from unleashed his rage on his daughter, the person you helped will be *nicer* than usual to theirs. They'll tell their family about the stranger who helped them, causing their spouse and children to feel a little better and more hopeful as well.

If we ever manage to help more than we hinder – even though doing so will always require some sacrifice from us – we'll also be frequently benefited by the help of others. And if enough of us do it often enough, the net result of acting righteously is positive both on the collective *and* on the individual level.

If acting as we should becomes the rule, whenever you find yourself in need of assistance the odds are someone will show up to provide it instead of everyone leaving you stranded to die on your own as usually happens. And even when you don't need any help at all everything will be much easier anyway, because then the rest of the world won't be actively trying to screw you at every turn.

Memetic Faith

Every creed, be it Christianity, Islam, neo-Nazism, communism, patriotism, or any other works the same way: they are *memes* – contagious intellectual viruses that spread exponentially, just like a biological infection, but via ignorance. As more examples, we have political correctness, fake news, and “Trumpclaims.”

Most of the time, we are wrong about something because we lack information, intellect, and/or memory. Our opinions are often flawed, but we share them with others believing otherwise, *accidentally* infecting and perverting their view of the world. Usually, those mistakes of ours don't turn into memes because they are not *contagious* enough – we mostly talk about things we are notoriously not experts in, so no one takes what we say too seriously; we tend to state it aloud when we are not entirely sure of something that is relevant; and most of what we say is simply not interesting enough for people to repeat it to others. So, most of our verbalized mistakes don't spread. They tend to die within a single listener, doing little damage. But we also have people who deliberately create *tantalizing lies* and then go around telling them to anyone who'll listen, as if they were actually true. Since most people don't bother thinking for themselves and never question the information they receive, they believe anything they hear, however absurd it may be. And the more absurd any piece of information is, the *more excited* people get about sharing it with others, and the more they do so. Once such a meme is

created and Patient Zero is infected with it, it doesn't take long before we have millions of people believing that the Earth is flat, one more actor winning an election, yet another disarmament campaign going on, or a new cult of pee-drinkers being formed.

Memes are also hereditary (although I might be extrapolating the original memetic theory here). See how you think social/economic equality is a good thing simply because *your parents* told you so, or how you believe a free, unregulated market is the way to go instead, for the same reason. It takes a long time for us to free ourselves from being misguided as a child, because we all fully trust our parents and teachers at our tender ages. Given that we only become able to think once we turn 12, and only start thinking about what's important once we are 30 or so (while hardly ever actually doing it because we are too busy working, paying bills and raising children), most people die without ever solving that problem – they die without ever reaching their *own* conclusions. And so long as they live, those people will keep spreading the memes they were infected with as children, compounded with the ones they are constantly fed by politicians, the media, “influencers,” etc.

People who eventually manage to stop and re-think what they've been told are bound to find out that much of what they “know” is pure nonsense.

Let us now focus on religions, which we might as well call “religious memes”. I'll use a real one as an example, to establish my point. Let's go with Islam, since it pisses Muslims off when infidels say anything about their beliefs and I want to help them get over it.

Consider how Muslim women are treated in Islamic societies. I'm vastly ignorant about the details of the subject, so I will just summarize my understanding of it with “they are stoned in the middle of the streets if some part of their legs, arms or hair is revealed from beneath their burqas.” I think that's mostly a metaphorical “general vibe,” literal only in Islamist (extremist) societies (I just checked, and only about 5% of all Muslim women are *legally* forced to wear hijabs, burqas or other such garments. In the vast majority of cases, these are worn due to social and religious pressure; not legal).

I think anyone reading this, regardless of whether they are a feminazi, a republican dinosaur, or sane, will agree when I say that

that misogynistic mentality, even if somewhat metaphorical, is irrational and abhorrent. And yet Muslims in general defend that women ought to be treated like that, simply because some ancient imaginary man supposedly said, according to a long-outdated anthology of unknown authorship, that they should be treated that way. It's much like Christianity's legends about boy-wonder Jesus or their rather irrational ten commandments: they're all just bedtime stories. I am confident, though, that the majority of Muslim men don't *really* believe that forcing women to unnecessarily hide their figures is correct or justifiable – I assume they generally love, or at least minimally respect, their own mothers, and that the vast majority of them are not gay as well. That restraining and potentially violent treatment is illogical, unnatural, and obviously unfair to any reasonable human being.

Let me open a parenthesis here: drastic measures such as the one mentioned above were probably once established under the premise that sexual desire leads men to act stupidly and harm others. And this premise *is* valid. But the solution for this particular flaw in our nature is not to limit people's freedom – which inevitably generates anger – but instead to increase their wisdom. It's not to institutionally force people to act against their will, but to teach them why they shouldn't act in certain ways and provide them with an education and an environment that allows them to behave decently. The adequate solution is not to control people, but to teach them to control *themselves*. And then to eliminate those who, despite receiving all the necessary support, turn out incapable of doing so.

Back on track: however absurd, religious memes are all around us. And they spread like any other meme: by word of mouth. By word of *ignorant* mouths. But how do religions survive after people find out that their teachings make no sense? That their tales are obvious lies? How can they last thousands of years? How do they thrive and become so powerful?

Unsurprisingly, through *fear*.

Imagine we have two Muslim men. Imagine neither of them believes that women should be forced to hide their whole bodies from sight, or that every Jew must be decapitated. *Neither*. Theoretically, that means they should have no problem with letting the women around them wear bikinis, or with having a beer with a guy with two ridiculous curly locks of hair dangling down from his temples. But no – they *will* behave “Islamically” and spit on any woman wearing a skirt or circumcised man they run into. Why? Because the first

Muslim believes the second will treat *him* as an infidel if he doesn't act that way, and *vice versa*.

What holds any religion together is the fact that each of its members is afraid of the others. A man cannot risk saying to another member of his congregation that their sacred text is irrational for fear of being attacked, just like he, himself, is religiously compelled to attack anyone else who says the same. If he dares to try, that man might fend off one or two of his fellow cultists, but the rest of their flock would swarm him to death.

People who "believe" in any of that religious crap are not all lunatics. Many of them are simply under implicit threat and frightened.

Hardly anyone adheres to a previously-established creed agreeing with all of its tenets. We each have our own personal experiences and consequently reach our own particular conclusions, and ours will hardly ever perfectly match someone else's. So, at some point, new members of any given religion are likely going to disagree with, doubt, and question some of its teachings and, from there on, they'll be forced to censor themselves and lie to others if they want to ensure their own personal safety.

Members of a cult are afraid not only of physical, but also moral and social violence. If they defy their religion's teachings (or its preachers), they will be excommunicated. They will lose most, if not all, of their friends and possibly family as well, because these all often adhere to the same faith, since we tend to surround ourselves only with people who agree with us.

Religions are a *trap*. They are an exploit of deep and seemingly irrevocable human flaws: our lack of intelligence, morals, courage, civility and individuality. They work because they are based on solid, ironically logical grounds: how fearful we are of each other. And they are a very powerful form of mass control, because they are extremely hard to break free of.

Note that political parties, as well as any other kind of shared-belief group, all behave essentially like a religion. Think about it and you'll see - they are all memes propagated by ignorance (unless their ideas are actually right which, so far, doesn't seem to have ever been the case) and enforced by very clear, albeit unspoken threats.

Most of our species' beliefs, acts and decisions are based on lies, and we keep scaring ourselves farther and farther away from the truth by summarily stoning anyone who dares to speak it.

If you've tried, you know arguing against zealots is a pointless endeavor. But there's a reason for that: they *need* to believe their ancient sacred texts are more than outdated philosophies embedded in juvenile fantasies. It's not that religious people cannot see reason, but rather that they don't *want* to. This is why using it on them doesn't work.

Proving those people wrong is very easy to do by using simple arguments. Thus, zealots must *cancel* anyone who tries to seed doubt into their minds and ranks. They cannot doubt their beliefs, because doubt is the first step to knowledge. They might often suspect they are wrong, but they cannot *know* it because, if they do, they'll realize they're actually a force of evil (despite what I'll kindly assume were their initial good intentions).

On top of being afraid of losing their family and friends, religious people cannot recognize the error of their ways because they have been wrong for *too long*. To admit they were misguided would be to admit they have been fooled; to admit that they were stupid and still are (since we may grow wiser but not smarter with time). They'd also have to admit all the harm they caused while aggressively trying to impose their ludicrous beliefs upon others. And admitting those things is hard, because the dignity lost cannot be recovered and the damaged done cannot be measured or atoned for.

Those people also refuse to accept they are wrong because they need to believe that paradise is real and that they will find themselves in it if they continue to do what they are told. If they acknowledge they were mistaken, all the time they wasted doing what they wrongfully thought was right will not *reward* them with anything. The miserable lives they were forced to live (not for being religious, but for being human) will have been entirely pointless, all of their suffering will have been in vain, and nothing but further despair will await them in the future. Can we really blame them for being so bullheaded? Yes, we can, because they enforce and spread a mental disease, harming not only themselves but countless others as well. But we must keep in mind that we would *all* fear reaching such a dire realization, and that we all blind ourselves the same way religious people do. We must believe the future somehow suits our wants and needs, otherwise we have no reason to keep going. We need to believe that what each one of us *can* do will take us where we *wish* to be - in this life or in a hypothetical next - otherwise our whole existence seems purposeless and suffering is all we'll ever know.

That's called "hope." We need it, and we all *forge* it when necessary.

Being religious when one has lived a hard, meaningless life is just as natural as being a nihilist is when one has lived an easy, full one.

Despite their fictional and manipulative nature, religions are not entirely bad. They do serve one constructive purpose: to inculcate the stupidest among us with a *contrived* sense of right and wrong.

I have a moral compass. I must have been born with some of it and our society, my family, friends, personal experiences, and above all my own thoughts tuned it to be what it is. In any non-highly-debatable situation, I know what the right moral choice is. Not knowing isn't an option. As a rule, I can either choose to do the right thing, or to do the wrong one and feel bad about it for the rest of my life. So I automatically try to stick to the first (full disclosure: miserable failures do occur).

It seems many people aren't like me, though. For one set of reasons or another, their north ended up pointing east, or even south. Most of them probably grew up under bad influences, didn't get beaten up enough, got beaten up too much, or are simply intellectually incapable of connecting the dots. They have grown, aged, and still don't understand how the world works and why they should try to make things better instead of worse. Thus they need to be taught by artificial means.

Those people need to be clearly told what to do and what not to, and convincing them requires clear, simple and unchangeable directives, which when strictly adhered to lead to rewards deemed desirable by all. A religion and its preachers come into play to convince such people that, if they act in a certain way, they'll get a pair of wings, a shiny halo, a cool harp, and go live in the clouds. If they do anything *other* than what they've been told, they'll burn in agony for all eternity. Christianity, for instance, teaches those who are incapable of guiding themselves not to murder anyone and not to bang their neighbor's wife. Those are concrete actions rather than the essence of what people should know and guide themselves by, but it does part of the trick - it's far from ideal, but it's *something*.

The main problem here is that whoever does the preaching gets to choose what is "right" and what is "wrong." They usually don't know either and, even if some of them eventually do, they still end up being seduced and corrupted by the influence they exert over their

flock. And what may have been initially meant to do good ends up existing and spreading just to satiate a few people's individual greed and thirst for power, while harming everyone else.

Trying to put it all shortly: religions are unforgiving systems based on fictitious collective beliefs that fear and police themselves. They are a mechanism that can be used to give those who suffer hope and to set the lost on a minimally civilized path, but which tends to end up serving mainly to empower and enrich one or a few individuals.

Religions spread memetically, through tantalizing lies repeated again and again until as many people as possible fall for them. Once a cult grows large enough, it automatically polices itself, because all of its members are implicitly encouraged to act violently against anyone (including themselves) who disagrees with its holy text or its preachers.

Religious people are in part forced and in part force themselves to deny reason, ignoring facts and, consequently, tainting everything they meddle with.

There's only one true religion: it's called "reason," it's called "science." Others may even serve as a temporary, palliative measure to deal with some of humanity's flaws but, ultimately, they all lead to hell.

A World Gone Retarded

Nowadays we praise criminals, vulgarity, poverty, stupidity. We demonize those who can and victimize those who can't. We silence those who are right while handing down free megaphones to anyone who isn't.

Take rap music, as a first example. People who "sing" them are usually imbeciles, often with a criminal background, who emit unpleasant noises that preach or downright incite uncalled-for violence, drug usage, promiscuity, theft, and all sorts of animalistic behavior. And yet people listen to and give money to them, catapulting those "artists" into celebrity status, spreading their word.

Consider American female pop stars, now. Taylor Swift, Katy Perry, Lady Gaga and the such, despite being actually able to sing (I know Gaga at least can), all dress up in whorish costumes and act like strippers during their shows, bouncing around half-naked on stage before spreading their legs wide open to a juvenile audience. Those “ladies” seem to be perfectly fine stripping and pole-dancing for money, like any common prostitute would. And then, as soon as they step off stage, they start preaching about their superior moral standards, about how women are mistreated by society, how they are more valuable than men, and how they are entitled to more rights than us. And people buy it.

What about professional athletes (again)? Most of them have two options: to become an athlete or a criminal (which includes becoming a police officer or joining the military), since without brains one has no options but to rely on brawn. Then, in the US, they cheat their way into college, getting full scholarships while people who actually want to study and are able to, who can learn and contribute, who have a chance to understand, discover, invent and improve, end up being left out.

Professional popular sports players are paid millions of dollars to do something the rest of us do for fun, for free, or even pay to. They become arrogant, believing they are better than everyone else because they can take a ball from one side of a field to the other (wow!). Then, they show up on the TV and people heed their every word as if those guys actually knew something about anything.

Democracy is shoved down our throats daily, left and right, from above and below, as if it was a flawless, idyllic political system. We let the most unqualified among us decide all of our fates and call it “wisdom.” All of our elections are in one way or another rigged, and we call them “fair.”

Owned and controlled by greedy kids with God complexes who employ even younger, brainwashed ones, social networks have been potentiating the political correctness meme, bringing censorship to an all-time high in the Western world. Saying one of the million things that are now considered taboo out loud has literally been criminalized in many places, and most of us believe that *not* discussing (which we currently don’t, because it’s not a discussion when only one whining and yelling side is heard) or even thinking about those problems will solve them.

Receiving their [filtered] information exclusively from those same social networks, young people become radically biased without even noticing and then go around calling *others* biased. They believe those who are posting videos on TikTok and YouTube know what they are talking about, while in reality such folks ended down there precisely due to knowing nothing and having never managed to do a single thing right in their lives.

Some of the most recent movies and TV series have been upping the ante on shocking effects, taking gore and homosexuality to the most gruesome and disgusting levels imaginable, because Gen Zs seem to have been rendered unsensitized to all standard stimuli thanks to receiving too much of everything too soon via the smartphones they were given when they turned 3 years old and haven't once left outside their reach ever since. Those kids will soon start having problems getting excited about or interested in anything, but no one seems to care about *them* either.

If you find a demented man dressed as an ugly woman that looks like a cheap doll rolled out of a faulty Chinese production line repulsive, you are "homophobic." If you ever acknowledge a black person did something wrong, you are "racist." If you call a member of the IDF a genocidal war criminal, you are an "antisemite." If you spent most of your life studying, then working, and earned some money for yourself, you are "privileged." If you defend yourself against a woman's verbal or physical assault, you are a "misogynist." And we've come to a point where you might actually end up in jail for doing or simply saying any of that.

If anyone tries to publicly deal with actual reality in any *reasonable* way, going against the widely disseminated and retarded trends currently allowed in our Overton's Window (that which is considered acceptable in public speech at a given time), they are automatically and overwhelmingly censored.

I read somewhere that censorship evolves in three stages:

Stage one: forbidding people from publishing what the censor doesn't want others to know;

Stage two: people start censoring, by themselves, what they publish before doing so, to avoid being persecuted;

Stage three: people avoid *thinking* about what has been censored, because any minor misstep can get them arrested, tortured and/or killed.

We, in the West, have reached the terminal stage of this social disease.

I will talk a little more about some of these issues I just mentioned further ahead, but they had to be all mentioned together to provide a picture of how ridiculous our species, or at least the Western portion of it, has become.

We ought to ask ourselves: how did we *get* to this point?

And I answer, even as I tire to repeat it: via *fear*.

We idolize those who are wrong, abide by censorship, and let those least qualified to guide us do so because standing up to those people would be suicide. Being afraid, we *tag along* with them instead. And as we do, our moral compasses become twisted.

To preserve ourselves, we side with those we disagree with and end up defending things we are morally against. To avoid being harassed, assaulted, kidnapped, maimed and murdered by large, violent, and potentially armed groups of people (whose greater exponents are governments) we can't possibly defend ourselves against, we publicly adopt their points of views, pretending to be one of them. To pretend convincingly, we need to *act* in accordance with our fakely adopted perspective. And once we've acted upon it, violating what we truly believe in and desecrating our own moral values, we are lost – we have become *hypocrites*. Our conscience is tarnished, our moral north spun out of place, and then, with our own conscience broken and removed out of the way, there's nothing left to stop us from doing wrong *again*.

Each time we do something we know we shouldn't, it becomes easier. We come up with increasingly absurd explanations to justify our condemnable actions and force ourselves to believe in them. The veil between "right" and "wrong" becomes blurrier; before long, it vanishes. Being irrational and harming others becomes the rule rather than an exception. Then we are no longer pure, clean; instead we are soiled, corrupted. Knowing the damage we've caused cannot be undone and that the line cannot be uncrossed, we keep moving farther beyond it. With our chance of being good gone, we embrace evil with arms, legs, and soul wide open. And then we have finally *become* one of those we initially feared, hated and despised.

The greater the number of despicable acts a person commits, the more their moral compass spins astray, the less their own conscience stops them from doing even worse, the more harm they cause, and the more they distance all of us from having a life worth living.

Each person that falls into that trap becomes one of “them” – one of those we must rid ourselves of. And the more of “them” there are the easier it is for them to corrupt others. The more of “them” there are the more people they force to undergo the whole process of shredding one’s own moral values.

By fearing those we should fight and thus refraining from doing so, we allow their numbers to grow exponentially. If they grow into large enough numbers, their lack of morals becomes endemic. And once it becomes *globally* endemic, humanity is lost.

This may sound a bit off-topic, but I should probably say a thing or two about the *perceived public opinion*.

The “public opinion” doesn’t exist; it’s not “a thing.” What exists is just the *perceived* one: what people believe is the actual public opinion but isn’t. Since no one can access every individual’s private and honest opinions, and we all have to wear social masks just to stay alive, none of us can possibly know what the *actual* public opinion is. And even if we could identify it, it would be useless because, with each one of us living in a different made-up reality and defending exclusively our own private interests, our true collective view of our species and of our society is bound to be an irrational mess of wildly different and often opposite notions – an absolutely useless compendium.

This is important because what politicians, big companies, and others with power use to evaluate, manipulate and please (so that they can profit from it) the masses is that *perceived* public opinion – a forged impression of a fantasized, falsely aligned society.

And who forges that impression?

The media.

Here’s my point: once you have been convinced, by the media, that everyone else believes in something, speaking aloud against it puts you in *danger*, because you’ll be attacked by a large number of people if you do so. You’ll *expect* that to happen, so you’ll stay quiet. Going against what is perceived to be the generally accepted

standard is self-destructive, because the many who are stupid enough to actually believe in it are usually also prone to assault and hurt others – including you.

Anyone who gets some TV time ends up influencing the “public opinion.” And the people who “pop-up” on our screens are usually politicians, who strive to protect only the interests of select groups; actors, who specialize in impersonating others; random experts, with questionable credentials and competence; comedians, who think everything is a joke; athletes, who failed second grade twice; journalists, strictly bound by their editors’ personal agendas; religious figures, who confuse fantasy with reality; or incompetent, failed people who fill the internet up with their ill-informed opinionated streams.

As we all listen to professional liars, people who don’t know half as much as they pretend to, jokers, troglodytes, manipulators, lunatics and idiots speaking, the general public assumes that what they all say is not only true, but also that those people’s view of the world is *normal* – since such people were allowed to manifest their opinions publicly, everyone is watching the same thing, and no one is doing anything to counter what they say, our instincts dictate that what we are all seeing must be credible, unquestionable, and not only acceptable but, in fact, *right*.

Unqualified people are allowed to speak publicly not because they should, but because someone is personally interested in them doing so – they are there because someone else *profits* from their words and appearances. And no one does anything about it because everyone is, yet again, afraid to: speaking against a politician might get you thrown in jail; speaking against a celebrity will spawn an army of their admirers to curse and threaten you; speaking against an athlete might get you physically assaulted by his team’s fans; speaking against a “half-expert” will be taken as an outsider attacking an entire class of professionals; and speaking against a media vehicle is just plain suicide, because they can force their opinions upon millions of people while yours can barely reach a dozen.

When people fear challenging someone, whatever bullshit spills out of that person’s mouth is treated as true even if it’s a lie. It’s treated as wisdom even if it’s obviously stupid. It’s treated as right even if it’s completely wrong. And as “the feared ones” keep making public statements, more and more people listen to their words, and more

and more people end up *actually* believing in them. (As a reminder: feel free to disagree with anything I say – *I am not going to hurt you.*)

Our moral values are superseded by the twisted ones “on air.” Our children grow with a misconception of reality, with a wrong notion of what a human being is, of what it means to be one, and of what we should aim to become. We end up with a world in which global powers condemn a country “in the strongest terms” because it started a war while at the same time they openly finance genocide against people who are doing nothing more than to seek justice on another corner of the planet. We end up with women physically assaulting their husbands and taking a dump on their beds then suing *the guy* for moral damages. We end up with millions of people believing democracy is a good idea, and with those who democratically disagree being beaten up to death by the police.

We start our lives off with a fairly reasonable sense of “good,” “bad” and “just.” And then, out of fear of what will happen to us if we stick to them, we deface or entirely abdicate our own moral values, siding with whatever our politicians and the media *claim* to be the “public opinion” in a sad, barely successful attempt to simply maintain our physical integrities and what little remains of our natural, theoretically irrevocable freedoms.

The perceived public opinion is a tool. It is created and manipulated by those in power to achieve their own desired ends. But now, with the advent of the internet, high-speed connections, and streaming, pretty much anyone can play this game.

We have random mongoloids all around, daily disseminating their idiotic ideas on YouTube for anyone who’s dumb enough to listen. But those folks are fairly irrelevant since they have no goal other than to make money for themselves, and they end up only misinforming the “few” (up to a few dozen millions, at most) fools who trust them. The internet entities that actually play the game, in the open and without shame, are the professional *trolls* (paid social media manipulators, fake-news disseminators, fake politics-focused accounts, etc.).

The purpose of internet trolls is the *same* as the media’s: it is to make us believe that, even when we *know* we are right, we are part of a small minority that stands no chance of overcoming the vast number of those who are wrong – so it would be “smart” for us to

shut up, bend over, and meekly take it from behind, “just like everyone else does.” Thousands, millions of fake accounts are created and people are paid to disseminate idiocies using them to make the rest of us afraid of saying out loud anything that violates their employer’s interests. Trolls are a modern, weaponized and unveiled tool of “manipulation by fear of being outnumbered.” They are the priests and imams of the internet, funded by private interests and shady governmental institutions alike.

Children and teenagers, in particular, are very easily swayed by anything they watch or listen to. They see the world through screens, trust anyone who appears in them, and naively believe in all kinds of nonsense. Even the smart ones are prone to fall for it, because the impression they get *is* that most people believe in “troll crap” and, being aware of their own ignorance about everything, they assume “most people” must be right. Young humans don’t know what is going on, they can’t quite think for themselves, and they don’t really care, because important stuff is adults’ stuff. Thus, the number of people who blindly defend what is wrong is steadily increasing. And the worst part is that those young people have already started *voting*, since this “social experiment” has already been going on for decades, guaranteeing that our species will keep making the wrong decisions at least for the next several decades.

If we add everything I’ve said in these last few pages together, we get an *endgame scenario*: if the media’s moral sense becomes *too* wretched; our governments’ and largest companies’ too as a consequence; everyone else is afraid of them, as every single one of us is; too many people truly believe in those institutions’ messages, which is always the case; and no one’s left who’s willing to sacrifice themselves to stand for what is actually right, we are doomed.

If we come to a point when there’s no one left on Earth who can see how broken we are and how dysfunctional human society has become, when there’s no one left willing to even *try* to fix our world, humanity will have been crippled and potentially rendered unable to evolve any further.

This is one possible way to *lose* “the game of life.”

As a final note, just because I mentioned “the brainwashed” (Gen Zs) have already started casting their ballots: whenever someone seeks to *lower* the age required for voting, the intention is to make the

dogmas they have been most recently disseminating start to have practical effects sooner (which means the damage done by them becomes irreversible faster as well).

Children will believe in anything those manipulating them want them to. And once they start weighing in on official decisions, whatever fantasy they were fed with becomes *law*, meaning that any sane person who voices their disagreement with it thereafter will be forcefully silenced and removed from society.

This fact could be used to fix a failed country and even our entire species, but it seems to be used far more often to the opposite effect.

While we don't manage to rid ourselves of democracy, only those above 30 and below 70 years of age should be allowed to vote. People in that layer are the only ones who take serious issues seriously and [partially] understand the world they live in, while having being brainwashed as children means we all need at least a couple of decades to realize this happened and start thinking for ourselves.

The Origin

I have a theory about how the political correctness meme, which basically defines current Western mentality and politics, began. My understanding is that it was a simple drive for profits and that three factors initiated it:

- 1 - Over the past several decades, *women* have been studying more, working, climbing the professional ladder, taking care of themselves and their own finances. Thus, having money of their own to spend, they became a relevant and important segment of the market;

- 2 - *Black people* tend to reproduce more and sooner than everyone else, which has been steadily increasing their representation as a percentage of the population in Western societies. Thus, by their sheer number, they became a relevant and important segment of the market;

- 3 - *Gay people*, as a rule, have no children, which leaves them with a lot more money than heterosexuals to spend. Once

homosexuality was decriminalized, gay marriage allowed, etc., they sprang out of their closets and went on shopping sprees. Thus, they became a relevant and important segment of the market as well.

Large companies noticed those changes and started adapting their marketing strategies, focusing more and more on women, black, and gay people, and at the same time less and less on white men, who already own most of what they want and need.

Media vehicles rely on advertisements for profits, so they started favoring those three groups in any way they could, biasing their productions and news deliveries to make their clients (the advertising companies) happier and their own pockets heavier.

Watching “empowered women,” black people whose “lives matter,” and garish homosexuals 24/7 on the TV, people in general started believing it all meant more than rich people trying to get even richer. That created a *political* issue.

Millennials and Gen Zs were increasingly brainwashed throughout their lives into believing short-haired women wearing men’s clothes, drag queens, and mixed-race couples are the rule rather than the exception, and a standard to be pursued rather than an aberration to be avoided. This turned the issue into an actual *problem*.

Socialists took advantage of this whole phenomenon and started defending those three groups of people in everything they could, turning them into guaranteed votes for the socialist cause. Together, they all started pushing for and in fact managed to acquire more rights for themselves than anyone else has. And this made the problem *serious*.

Our brainwashed youngsters grew up to create Facebook, Twitter, and other meme-spreading platforms. Making billions of dollars at an early age by selling stocks of companies that provide a disservice to society to greedy Wall Street speculators who couldn’t possibly care less about their clients’ assets, those kids became famous and worshiped – after all, who doesn’t want to become a billionaire before they are 25?

Such Zuckerbergers were considered visionaries on top of everything else. They were given free rein over their companies and retained direct control of these, even after their businesses went public along with their disturbing practices. Their personal views were allowed to guide the social networks they had just created, and

those folks all share the exact same opinion: that whoever makes the *most noise* is right (despite the fact that smart people tend to be the quietest).

Being young, rich, idolized, and brainwashed since childhood, those social-media TED-talkers immediately set off to impose their profit-driven, “politically correct” views on all users of their platforms, censoring anyone with a divergent opinion without legal or moral bounds. With traditional and social media both brainwashing people in the wrong direction and silencing any and all reasonable voices as much as they possibly can, they’ve guaranteed that anyone being born in the West will be infected with the disturbing and disruptive meme of political correctness.

To top it all, Hollywood set off to grab its piece of the cake and started writing for, casting, and putting into protagonist roles as many women, gay, and black people as they could. The American propaganda engine is now run by a socialist hub of twisted morality, fiercely imposing the leftist agenda on anyone who just wants to sit down and watch a good movie (incidentally making these very scarce).

That’s my understanding of how the whole “political correctness” notion was born and developed. And none of those responsible for it seems to have ever considered where their actions were taking us other than as far as their bank accounts stretch. The path of greed has always been a bloody one, but people never tire of following it.

This whole thing started as a simple money-grabbing scheme, conducted by the same old greedy bastards that have always run everything. Nowadays, literal psychopaths are deliberately chosen to run every single company that has stocks in the market, and those guys don’t give a damn about how much damage they cause to anyone or anything (fun fact: I always assumed China developed its current technology by reverse-engineering Western products manufactured there, but I was wrong. I recently learned that our psychos actually handed *all* Western technology to China for free, just to gain access to the Chinese market and factories, turn a quick profit, and look good in front of their companies’ boards and shareholders). Those folks don’t take the non-financial consequences of their actions into consideration at all, because they simply don’t care. And thanks to those sick people, the Western magnates’ greedy schemes backfired this time: by putting in charge those who seek the highest profits at any cost, they ended up empowering their worst enemies. Our tycoons’ insatiable thirst for money turned women,

black, and gay people into a mass of maneuver for socialists, igniting a political revolution that aims to destroy everything they've built and steal everything they have (and they also turned China into a superpower). And the rest of us got unwillingly caught in the middle of it. Whereas we have all always been ripped-off and exploited by "the wealthy capitalist," now we also have our rights trimmed to the stem while those three trending groups' (women, black people and gays) keep multiplying. And if that wasn't bad enough, we are now also overtaxed by our governments and forced to freely give most of what we work our entire lives to have to the "poor" who still form the core electoral base of the socialists.

The political correctness meme entails shielding groups of people behind words such as "racism," "homophobia" and "misogyny;" it disregards merit and actually *eats away* at equality via DEI policies; it erodes society by encouraging acts and behaviors that ignore what is reasonable and fair. By paving the way with those words to reach such ends, it succeeded in ruining everything. And while hiding under an anti-hate banner, social justice warriors only *increase* hatred, because this is the logical and inevitable consequence of curtailing and violating other people's natural rights.

The only purpose the political correctness meme serves is to put a handful of socialists in charge and keep them there, so that they can steal everything from *all* of us. In the long run, this idiocy doesn't do the rest of us any good - regardless of our gender, sexual orientation or skin color.

It's high time we rid ourselves of this populist, destructive notion.

Our "Specieses"

I don't know about you, but when I was in school I was taught that a species is defined as such by whether the offspring of two mating animals is fertile or not. If two animals copulate and their offspring is able to reproduce, those animals are considered members of the same species, even if of different races. If their offspring is infertile, those mating animals are considered members of different species.

Well, it turns out that that definition is inaccurate.

Though we are (or at least were, in my time) taught that as if it was carved in stone, it isn't. There's still debate among biologists as to what defines a species, because the fertility of two animals' offspring, like anything else, isn't either zero or 100% – it can be anything in between, depending on the genetic differences between the pair of breeders.

That's relevant because the fertility rate of a *mixed*-race human couple's offspring is *lower* than that of a single-race's², which raises the question: are white, Asian, black, Indian, and people of other ethnicities just members of different races, or of different species?

What about apes? And hominid aliens?

You get to choose. Since there's no clear line drawn by nature itself, you can draw your own. If you don't, someone else will in your stead, and they'll do so based on *their* political ideologies. You will always have scientific grounds to contest it, though.

While verifying that, I also learned that the dissolution rate of exogamous (mixed-race) marriages is also higher than that of endogamous (single-race) ones³. It is hypothesized that this happens mostly due to *cultural* differences between people of different races, which I agree with (so long as the word "mostly" is in there). Still, the empirical evidence we have suggests that matching people who don't match doesn't work very well, neither genetically nor socially.

What a surprise.

Regardless of whether we are all members of the same species or not, and even though we have much in common with each other, we are all different people – we don't look alike, we behave differently, and we come from different places, in different shapes and colors.

Despite what some like to claim, a person's physical characteristics, such as skin color and physiognomy, *are* indicators of what to expect from them, because they define said person as a member of a certain group. People belonging to the same one tend to have similar physical traits due to living in the same environment, reproducing among themselves, practicing the same activities and adopting similar lifestyles.

² **Source:** <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8274554/> (Accessed in March, 2024)

³ **Source:** <https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol47/17/47-17.pdf> - Page 493 (Accessed in March, 2024)

Those physical traits work as an indicator of both a person's *genes* and their *culture*. The second is what matters the most – a group's moral values, traditions, habits, etc. – but the first is not as unimportant as some like to claim.

It takes a long time for us to assimilate and adapt to our own culture, to the one we are born into. We are raised in and molded by it; we have to learn it. Most of us are not willing or even capable to undergo that whole process a second time if/when joining or interacting with people who have different values, who speak a different language and live in a foreign reality. And different cultures *clash*. What is adored by a group of people may be shunned by another. What is encouraged by some may be considered a crime by others. One people's ways may lead to social, economic and technological developments, while another's may lead to zealotry, thieving, enslavement, wide-spread corruption, civil war and anarchy.

Being born and raised in a nurturing environment, to a good family, and as part of a society that encourages and supports that which ought to improve human life seem to be the most important factors in defining how any one of us turns out. But much of what/who we are is also tied to our DNA, and each group of people's genes evolved in particular ways, throughout hundreds of thousands of years, to make each [definable] one of them intrinsically different from the others.

The genetic difference between people from different races is minimal, but its relevance doesn't necessarily match that percentage. We share 99% of our DNA with chimpanzees, and the remaining 1% clearly makes quite a difference. We share 99.9% with other human beings, but our *alleles* – variations of the same gene that, for instance, determine an individual's type and color of hair, blood type, and propensity to develop certain diseases – can vary up to 7%, and they are anything *but* irrelevant.

Our genetic material determines how our brain develops, our height, hormonal production, appearance, intellectual and motor capabilities, how much fat our bodies accumulate and where, how much our muscles can grow, etc. And members of the same ethnic group have more genes *and* alleles in common. Genetically speaking, it is our alleles that define different races of human beings (though our official, socially-inclined definition takes culture into account as well).

Scientists, as you have probably noticed, tend to downplay the importance of genetic differences when talking about different human beings. If they didn't, they would be called "racists!" and persecuted by the left half of our society. When the people who are supposed to know better than anyone else about something feel coerced not to share the truth of their findings, the rest of us are left oblivious to it. And this includes me, so I'm forced to *infer* the true importance of the genetic differences between human beings of different races.

Following my own reasoning, I say our genetic differences are not as important as our cultural ones because there's evidence to support this: what have Stephen Hawking's, Richard Feynman's, Niels Bohr's, Alexander, The Great's, Napoleon's, Abraham Lincoln's, or any other "accomplished figure's" *children* accomplished? (Note: I don't know if all of them had children, and the worth of their respective accomplishments is debatable.)

In theory, those people's progenies had the genetic material required to follow in their parents' footsteps - to do something extraordinary. But they all turned out like anyone else. I've never heard anything about any of them, so I assume they all became normal folks, leading mostly normal lives, doing nothing worthy of particular note.

All those historical figures weren't "great" because of their genes. They were extraordinarily successful thanks to pure chance; thanks to appropriate circumstances and a long series of inevitable accidents (which nonetheless involve being born in the right group/community/country). Their genes were part of what led to their accomplishments, but not the *decisive* one.

At the same time, our genes and alleles are far from irrelevant because someone could have, as a deliberately exaggerated example, a genetic propensity to enjoy the taste of human meat while also hating any other food's. If an *allele* can cause that, then the issue is much greater. And I don't have to tell you what cannibalism leads to (obviously, to no desirable outcome).

Some good genes/alleles can also have bad consequences, and vice versa. For instance, black people in general have a higher bone density and more muscular mass than the rest of the human race. That's a good thing. But as previously established, when people have any kind of advantage they tend to use it to *abuse* others. This means that, by having some physical superiority, black people have a tendency to physically attack others for no good reason, and also to

focus on physical activities rather than on intellectual ones. And both of those things are highly undesirable, because they are non-constructive. In practice, having a group of people physically stronger than others is *detrimental* for human society (although simply keeping people of different races apart can mitigate this issue).

Light-skinned people get first-degree burns if they stand under the sun for more than 30 minutes or so. It sucks. But whiter skin requires considerably less sunlight to synthesize vitamin D, meaning white folks don't *need* to spend much time outside. This allows us to dedicate more time to intellectual tasks and to keep our sanity in cold environments (when most of the human body must be covered by clothes, thus having almost no contact with sunlight).

We also have the Asians who, due to a genetic deficiency in the aldehyde dehydrogenase enzyme, get flushed when they drink alcohol, which isn't good. But thanks to that, they avoid drinking, which leads to much fewer cases of alcoholism among Asians than among people of other ethnicities and, as another consequence, they also rarely throw up in someone else's car or run people over while driving theirs, which are both good things for everyone.

The difference in genes and alleles between human beings can and do have a *much* greater importance than the simple percentage variation found between them leads us to believe, because every allele can lead to relevant consequences of its own.

Let me explain why our cultural and genetic differences really matter.

Let's say that our objective, as a species, is scientific advancement. For that, we need *intelligence* - everything in the universe works logically, and intelligence is the capability to identify and apply this natural coherence to our thoughts and actions. "Intelligence" includes many different skills, such as being able to store and recall information, to accurately picture something in one's mind, to quickly make mathematical calculations without the need of external aides, to organize ideas in a clear and effective way, to transmit these ideas efficiently, etc.

With that assumed goal in mind, there *is* a desirable set of genetic material and behavioral (cultural) patterns that will make achieving

it much easier. And not only easier, but those traits are probably *necessary* for our objective to be achieved.

Having resilient bones, accurate and fast movements, or more strength are all positive and, in principle, desirable genetic attributes. But those cause social problems on their own, and they are only [somewhat] useful in heavy manual labor, which is nearly obsolete now that machines created by those with a superior intellect can do far more than any man.

If we have a group who is genetically and culturally predisposed towards a higher intelligence and a second group that has a predisposition for physical prowess, one of these groups will, invariably, achieve our desired goal much faster than the other (again: *if* this one ever even manages to). So we must have a proper objective in mind; we must take our differences into account; and we must favor individuals and groups that are likely to realize that goal. And we should *eliminate* the others, because these exist only to hinder the first ones.

There is *always* a relative genetic/cultural superiority between different groups of people when *any* specific goal is taken into account. And we do have goals – we may not have established them very clearly, but the proper ones are out there, somewhere. Regardless of whether we are aware of them or not, or of how long it may take us to become so, such goals exist and we must find and pursue them.

There's a technical term for acknowledging that our differences matter, and that some of us are objectively better than others; a term for simply understanding that this *is* how our universe works. According to the dictionary, the word for it is "racism."

Dumbing that all down just to make it perfectly clear, try the following test:

Choose the bird you believe can fly farther.

Bird 1: A Greater Cormorant.

Bird 2: A Flightless Cormorant.

Hint: Pay attention to their names.

If you chose the Flightless Cormorant, you are retarded. If you chose the Greater one, you are a racist.

Welcome to the team!

You probably already had your mind made (or made *for* you) about racial issues. And you may believe that *mixing everyone* up will lead to our species keeping the best of all human genes/alleles. That's what I was told as a child, and I believed it for a long time. If you don't put any thought into it, it seems plausible. Why not?

Well, there is a why.

Initially, that idea may seem reasonable. Stronger genes are, by definition, those that increase our odds of survival, and if we have both of our parents' "best survival genes" our odds of surviving are better than their individual ones which, in turn, should lead to us reproducing more than them and our superior genes propagating further. So far, so good. But there's a catch.

For starters, the odds of someone inheriting any of their parents' genes is "random." Mostly it's a 50/50 chance, meaning that even if those parents have ten children it's still possible none of these will inherit any of their desirable characteristics. And we also have *dominant* and *recessive* alleles, with respectively higher or lower than average chances of being expressed (meaning "to have practical effects"). So how does natural evolution decide which gene/allele is the best? How does it know what our species needs and deliberately encourages it?

It doesn't.

Not all desirable alleles are dominant, and not all undesirable alleles are recessive, meaning that inheriting and expressing all of the best alleles available is extremely unlikely. The odds of a *desirable recessive allele* being expressed are low, increased considerably if both parents have it. Meanwhile, the odds of inheriting and expressing an *undesirable dominant allele* start at 50%, and yet are *nullified* if neither parent has it. That means there's only a small chance of good recessive alleles having effect if we randomly mix people up, and a guaranteed chance to eliminate bad alleles (recessive *or* dominant) if we don't mix the people carrying these with anyone else.

The outcome of mixing random people up isn't necessarily beneficial. It often isn't, and it's definitely *not ideal*.

As a second point, natural evolution – merging DNAs at random and seeing which genes/alleles survive thanks to blind luck – is inadequate for us. First, because it simply no longer applies, since we created and constantly change the environment we live in, making it so that there's no *stable* standard for us to adapt to. Second, because we already tamper with this kind of evolution, for example, when our governments subsidize people who cannot sustain themselves, deliberately propagating genes that, in theory, should be eradicated.

The claim that “the strongest genes [naturally] survive” is only valid in a fairly stable scenario that spans many thousands or millions of years, one in which we drift randomly through life instead of choosing and chasing a future we actually want. “To evolve naturally” means “to do nothing for a very long time and *hope* for a positive outcome.” How many times has this strategy worked for you?

Letting natural evolution decide our fate is the same as driving somewhere and rolling a dice to decide in which direction we'll turn whenever we reach a crossroad. Given the distance we are driving, doing this would lead us anywhere *except* where we want to go.

“Hope is not a tactic,” as some people say. As intelligent beings, we can do better than to leave our entire future to chance. We must choose what world we want to live in and build it. And the random breeding of people may not even *allow* for that to happen.

We are All Bigots

In the television series *Through the Wormhole*, there's an episode titled “Are We All Bigots?”⁴ And the answer to that question, they concluded, is “yes.”

In my language, we use the word “pre-concept” instead of “bias” or “prejudice.” I find this amusing because it's a misnomer – prejudice is, in fact, the opposite: it's not a pre-concept, but a *post*-concept. We

⁴ *Through the Wormhole*, season 6, episode 1. **Source:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ajx0zpvBvXw> (Accessed in January, 2024)

treat different kinds of people differently because we learned, from our past experiences, that they *do* behave differently. We take into account what we *know* about a group of people and initially apply it to individuals belonging to it, or vice versa. Doing so is only logical.

Let's say an alien race decides to land their massive, gun-filled spaceships on Earth. Millions of aliens drop off of them, all carrying plasma rifles and donning state-of-the-art battlesuits. And then one – just *one* – of them suddenly shoots a human being in the chest, melting this random person to a puddle for no apparent reason. Would you assume the rest of the aliens are friendly and quickly approach to greet and hug one of them? Or are you a biased racist who would instead grab a gun and find a place to barricade yourself in?

Being biased is a matter of survival. We don't pet a tiger if we have any idea of how tigers in general behave, and we don't pet *any* tiger if we have seen how any *one* of them behaves. When dealing with anything we know can harm us, we must be careful. For our own sake, we must *assume* the worst. And the most evil, and thus the most menacing thing in the universe we are aware of is other human beings.

When we see a person that doesn't belong to our group – which is more easily distinguished by skin color, followed by other physical traits and spoken language – doing something we find deplorable, we automatically pin that kind of behavior on their *race* for two reasons:

- 1 – Because we need to know what to expect from people *like* the one in question, so as to be prepared to deal with them;
- 2 – And because we mentally try to *separate ourselves* from those who [in our opinion] don't know how to behave properly.

The first reason is, again, only logical. All we know about people who are different from us is this very fact: that they are *not like us*. If they don't look and/or talk as we do, we know they come from a different background from ours, we know they have different values, we know they don't think like we do. If they have different values and don't think like we do, they don't act like us. If they don't act like us, we don't know what to expect from them. If we don't know what to expect from them, they are a potential threat. If they are a potential threat and we see one of them doing something despicable, even if only once, for our own safety we must assume all those who are like them are capable of doing the same. And by assuming so we can no

longer trust *any* of them. Doing anything else could literally get us killed.

At the same time, we, humans, don't have enough encephalic mass to distinguish eight billion people from one another, to dedicate whole clusters of neurons to each individual we met in the past and leave many more free to fit those we'll meet in the future. So we simplify things, *generalizing*.

In the second case I listed earlier - to separate ourselves from those who don't know how to behave - we think: "I find their attitude and actions condemnable, because it violates what I believe is right. I would never do that. People *like me* would never do that." That's part of our need to feel superior, to believe we are better than others. Sometimes we are, indeed, better; but sometimes we are not. And we still think the same way in the second case, telling ourselves, "I only did this wrong thing once. I'm not *really* like that."

We may also witness people of our own group doing something we shun, which leads to a third but yet of a similar nature thought. In such cases, we think, "They must have had *some reason* to do it." And then, since they are "one of us," we blame the *individual* and not the collective, singling them out, because the alternative would be to include ourselves, which we either refuse to do out of hypocrisy or we simply can't, in case we really don't act in such a way.

Our options are to either feel better by choosing to believe we do not commit acts we despise, or to feel worse by not doing so. Since the second alternative is self-destructive, we naturally go with the first.

Regarding others, we can generalize our individual perception of them, individualize our general perception of their group, or do neither. If we go with one of the first two options, we are being racist. If we don't, we die. And that makes choosing whether to be a racist or not very easy. In fact, we don't even have to think about it - our instincts automatically choose for us because, throughout hundreds of thousands of years, we have all learned that being racist *is* the proper way to protect ourselves.

Racism is a logical consequence of natural facts; it stems directly from how our universe works. And the *illegal* form of racism - which is to actually treat someone worse than others based exclusively on their ethnicity - is just a natural consequence of logical and ideological racism.

As things currently stand, if we don't discriminate against others based on their race, we risk our own lives. If we do discriminate, we end up in jail. So what *can* we do?

One alternative would be to keep people of different races apart. But this ship has long sailed (literally). Another alternative would be to decriminalize the illegal form of racism (though it seems the ideological form of it has already been implicitly "miscriminalized" too). But this is not going to happen either and, while different races of people inhabit the same territories, doing so would tend to generate escalating conflicts (which is a very bad thing for reasons I'll explain later).

A third alternative is what we end up doing in practice: we are wary of those who are unlike us but treat them politely, risking our own safety and well-being until they actually do something wrong. But once they do, we can't say or do anything about it, because by taking any action we'd risk being publicly crucified on the TV and ending up in jail. As a consequence, instead of just being wary we start to *hate* those who are different from us, because we could have stopped one of their people from doing something wrong but our own laws, written exclusively in their favor, didn't allow us to. And now no one can resurrect that 12 year-old blond blue-eyed girl who got raped and stabbed to death.

Dramatic events such as the one I just used as an example are rare, though. In the vast majority of cases, nothing serious happens and we all manage to get along somewhat peacefully, mostly by *avoiding* those who are unlike us as much as we possibly can. But criminalizing racism is a double-edged sword, because it can *enable* crimes to occur by making anyone of a different ethnicity (or rather "with a lighter skin," since racism, in the Western world and in practice, applies exclusively to one race) from the perpetrator's refuse to intervene when they witness a criminal or otherwise immoral act.

Finally and thankfully, we have a fourth alternative available which is to have a *single race* of human beings inhabiting Earth. And this is the only *actual solution* to the problem.

The Dark Side

I was going to be subtle about it but, given that part of the purpose of this text is to openly say what most people refrain from, I'm going to be deliberately blunt instead:

Black people suck.

I'm confident most people of any ethnicity who interacted with black ones at least a few times have, like me, had unpleasant experiences from doing so. But besides personal takes, there are also several genetic, sociological, cultural, historical and otherwise notorious facts that justify that blunt statement of mine (beyond any doubt, I'd say).

In that episode of *Through the Wormhole* I mentioned earlier ("Are We All Bigots?"), they presented an experiment in which researchers showed pictures of angry and happy people to human subjects and then measured these ones' brains' responses. It was discovered that, when we see the image of an angry person, our brains detect hostility and "get on edge" (for lack of a more technical term). When we see a happy one, our brains "relax." But when the person is black, the human brain detects hostility *regardless* of their demeanor. That means our brains are naturally programmed to recognize any black person as a *hostile* at all times - and that includes black people's brains as well, as the results were the same for people of all ethnicities.

Some of us don't feel any sexual attraction to black people. I know this about myself, and a friend once told me the same thing. That's too small a pool to draw any statistical conclusion from, so I will just speak for myself: for me, looking at a naked black woman is like staring at a tree: my brain simply doesn't respond to it; there's no arousal whatsoever. I'm fine with white, Asian, Latin, Indian, Middle-Eastern women - a hot one is a hot one and my brain recognizes it, regardless of ethnicity or my personal opinions. Unless they are black.

Paired up, the two arguments I just provided lead to the conclusion that we are *evolutionarily programmed* to dislike black people. And the only logical explanation I can come up with for every human brain to have evolved throughout hundreds of thousands of years to behave this way is for black people to have been *causing problems* for everyone for a very long time.

Light-skinned people often blush when they feel ashamed. In some book, I read it is believed that the social purpose of that trait is to

show our peers we know when we messed up and that we regret it. Although embarrassing, it generates empathy and shows others we do know the difference between right and wrong, and that we rue it when we fail to do the first. The blushing and ensuing embarrassment, though unpleasant on their own, have the positive consequence of making us more civilized since we try to avoid letting it happen (just like Asians in general avoid drinking, for the same reason). Black people don't blush.

According to the United States Department of Justice, black people are 5.7 times more likely to be imprisoned than white ones⁵. That is, of course, in good part due to racial persecution by American police officers. But this defense is largely negated by the fact that Hispanics – who comprise a greater percentage of the American population than black people do, who are also “discriminated” against, and who are more inclined toward becoming gang members – are about 3 times less likely to be incarcerated than black people, indicating that simple racial bias is not the main issue. The main problem is the *actual behavior* of Afro-descendants.

We are all taught, in school, that white men enslaved African people. But that's only a half-truth. According to Yuval Noah Harari, in *Sapiens*, the Africans actually *enslaved themselves*. They hunted and captured their own people (from rival tribes, I assume) and then took those captive to the Middle East slave markets, where the Europeans finally bought their slaves from. I'm not saying the part white people played in the slave trade was morally justifiable, but I don't think we are the worst evil in that story. And it's particularly strange that our history books omit this particular fact, because hiding it doesn't help anyone.

I don't need to tell you how any African country compares to other nations where the majority of the population has fair skin. Maybe the prevailing ethnicity of the population of every first-world country on Earth? *Always* light, though not necessarily white.

The average IQ of every single African country is also among the lowest on the planet⁶, averaging 70 or so (a rough estimate, as I didn't do the actual math. The real number might be considerably lower) as a continent.

⁵ **Source:** <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/p20st.pdf> (Accessed in January, 2024)

⁶ **Source:** <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/average-iq-by-country> (Accessed in January, 2024)

The human race, as the scientific evidence we have suggests, was born in Africa. This means that those living there have had 2.8 million years to develop (since the birth of the Homo genus). And they didn't, while everyone else who left the continent eventually managed to, to a higher or lesser extent. This leads to the conclusion that what *allowed* the human race to progress past tribalism was precisely to get away from black people. Those among them who were better than the rest *had* to leave the continent to bring our species to the point where we stand today. Had they remained in Africa, doing so would probably have been impossible.

Circa 1914, European countries dominated about 90% of Africa. And then they all simply decided to cede control over it. Why? Because trying to do anything useful with it was a waste of time.

Have you ever seen a non-black person (other than Jews) accusing someone else of racism? I haven't. Some of our laws were written *specifically* for them (and similar ones for the Jews), and not for everyone, because most racial hatred is directed towards black people (and Jews, once again). And the only reasonable explanation I can come up with as to why that happens is for them (both) to have *earned* it. Thanks to our naiveté and stupidity, the fact that those people(s) have been antagonizing others ever since they exist has now led to them being rewarded instead of duly punished. Now, thanks to the laws the most gullible, corrupt, and/or ill-intentioned among our politicians have enacted, those people use racism not as a means to defend their legitimate rights, but as a shield that allows them to violate everyone else's.

To me, all this evidence proves a point, the point is undeniable, and the ensuing conclusion inevitable: black people are the antithesis of human development. The African genes, culture, mentality and way of life lead to *stagnation* in very primitive conditions, barring life from ever fulfilling its purpose. (Black people born elsewhere do show *some* improvements though, thanks to cultural changes.)

I'm not saying we should go out killing every black person we see in front of us. That's one way to go, yes, but there are some good people among them just as there are many bad ones among all other races, so doing that wouldn't be fair or lead to the best results possible. What I'm saying is we should avoid giving black people any kind of advantage, undue encouragement or, least of all, power, because history has proven beyond any reasonable doubt that their innate way of doing things leads to ignorance, anarchy, famine, despair and desolation.

Also, for God's sake, do *not* donate money to institutions begging for it to help sick and starving children in Africa. You didn't condemn those kids to life, you are not the one to blame for their woes, and if you save two of them today we'll all have twenty more begging us for help tomorrow. Donating anything to those people is an "investment" in extending and multiplying suffering – above all, *their* suffering.

White Trash

There aren't many saints on this side of the rainbow either.

We, white men, have been killing and torturing ourselves and others for a very long time. Europe has gone through countless geopolitical reconfigurations due to all of its countries incessantly invading each other over the centuries; we were responsible for the crusades, the inquisition, two world wars (so far) and the Holocaust; we created despot kings, greedy bankers, monopolists, cartels, the mafia, Bernie Madoffs, Microsofts, NSAs, Epsteins, Jeff Bezoses, and countless other regrettable people, companies and institutions.

Ironically, the advent of nuclear bombs seems to have settled us down, at least on a global scale. Their dissuasive assurance of mutual destruction put yet some more of that omnipresent and all-governing fear into us, forcing the Western portion of mankind, and the rest of it by extension, to partially overcome (or rather "hide") part of its violent nature.

What I actually want to mention, though, are two historical facts that up until recently I was unaware of. "History is written by the victors" and these, of course, always omit the parts of it they are not particularly proud of. So it takes time until one accidentally bumps into some of those hidden truths (if anyone ever does).

Have you ever heard about the British and American terror-bombings in Germany, near the end of WWII? Or about the Opium Wars? I hadn't. What the United States did to Hiroshima and Nagasaki is well known, but I'm no longer certain that was the Westerns' darkest hour in [modern] history.

During WWII, *after* the tide had already turned and the Nazis were losing, the RAF and the USAF started a terrorist bombing campaign in Germany. That's the term they used themselves: "terrorism."

England and the United States both targeted many German cities full of civilians and refugees, sending waves of thousands of bombers to raze them to the ground. Military factories and facilities were often completely ignored, as the declared objective, according to Churchill himself, was to demoralize and panic the country's entire population; in his own words, to terrorize the German people. That's all according to a clearly propagandist pro-Germany documentary I watched to hear the other side of the story, in which Churchill's own voice could be heard saying that. (I did later confirm the veracity of the "terror bombings" themselves on Wikipedia.)

After the Allied bombers dropped their loads, German survivors would come out of their hideouts to help those who were hurt in the attack and rescue people trapped under rubble. And then, about thirty minutes after the initial bomb-run - once people had come out of their shelters to start helping those in need - the British and the Americans sent in a second wave of bombers, this time with *incendiary* payloads. They baited people out, then burned them alive. I can't be sure of it, but that was probably when and where the infamous "double-tap" tactic, still used to this day by Israelis and Russians alike, was born.

Hundreds of thousands of German civilians were deliberately and cruelly murdered. Many were charred while stuck to the molten asphalt around their feet or cooked alive inside their shelters. And since I'm currently doing the Devil's advocate's work: if we are to compare how shocking the images of what the Nazis did to the Jews and the images of what the Americans and British did to the Germans are, these ones seem to have gotten the worst of it.

I don't like what the Nazis did during WWII any more than the next guy does, but they were not *crazy*. They had their reasons, though I'm not entirely sure what these were. After the state their country was left in following WWI, the Germans pulled off what has probably been the biggest come-back in human history, and madness doesn't do that - madness doesn't rebuild a ruined country, ignite its economy, and nearly defeats most of the world's strongest armies combined in just three decades. *Reason* does that. Since humans were involved, some degree of insanity is inevitable; but given that everything in our universe follows logic, anything that *works* must follow it as well. Also, despite the support the Nazis received from a

large part of their population, many among the German people were also against Hitler's ideals and methods (more than thirty attempts were carried out against Hitler's life by his own people. By comparison, only four were carried out against Trump by Americans [so far]).

Indiscriminately double-tapping German civilians with incendiary payloads, many of which were against Hitler but couldn't actually *do* anything against the Reich - thus being a victim of it themselves - makes me wonder if the Nazis were indeed the worst party involved in that whole chapter of history. They possibly were, but this is not nearly as obvious as we are all induced to believe.

It's also curious that a lot is said about the Holocaust, which led to the death of six million Jews, while virtually nothing is ever said about the five million people of *other* ethnic minorities who were also killed by the Nazis. This says a lot about how involved in post-WWII propaganda the Jews are, and how much political influence they have in the Western World - especially in the US and UK.

I had never heard the Opium Wars being mentioned anywhere until I watched an old B-movie about them and then looked it up online.

In the late 18th century, the British expanded their opium plantations in India and started selling large amounts of their produce to China. A few decades later, by 1830, most of the Chinese population was addicted to the British opium and a good share of their wealth was being siphoned out by His Royal Majesty's drug dealers.

In 1839, the Chinese emperor banned opium consumption and trade in his country. Others had already tried to before him, with no success. This time, though, the Chinese confiscated a large amount of the drug from docked British ships, arrested and executed many corrupt port officials, really tackled the issue.

Unwilling to let their chicken of the golden eggs go astray, the British declared war on China. With much stronger cannons, they could keep their ships safely away from the Chinese defenses as they tore these down. It was a slaughter. They took fort after fort, forcing China to quickly surrender.

Following their victory, the British forced the Chinese to build five new ports for trade, to pay for the aggressor's war expenses and for the opium loads previously confiscated, and to cede Hong Kong to

Britain in perpetuity (birthing the Hong Kong/China problem that persists to this day). Having no choice, the Chinese abided by the demands.

In 1853, while a portion of their country was rebelling, the Chinese tried to fight the opium trade once again. They seized *one* British ship, this time. Also, somewhere in the middle of the rebellion, a French missionary was killed. So guess what?

The British immediately declared war on China again. Using that dead missionary as a lame excuse, France joined in. And being just as greedy as those two, Russia attended the party as well.

This time, those three countries forced China to legalize the opium trade; to build *ten* more ports mainly dedicated to it; to exempt European countries from import tariffs; to once again pay for everybody's war expenses; and to allow foreign traders and missionaries free transit over Chinese territory.

Essentially, China was enslaved and turned into a silver-mining opium den to finance the Europeans' feasts, orgies and future imperialistic endeavors.

Some Americans also took a bite off the cake, of course. Warren Delano Jr. was one of them, and I think it's fair to assume that the fortune he amassed by exploiting the Chinese people was in great part responsible for, years later, electing his grandson, Franklin, president of the United States.

I wouldn't blame the Chinese if, now that their country has become a superpower, they decided to seek retribution. Or *justice*, to use the appropriate term (though the retaliation would be directed not at the people who caused them harm but at these ones' descendants instead, actually making the usage of the word "justice" debatable. At the same time, those people still thrive on the grounds partially built by that which they stole from the Chinese, and none of the countries that abused them considered returning the product of their crimes or atoning in any way for what their ancestors did. They never even officially apologized to China for their actions. So... I'll stick to "justice").

Let's just hope China doesn't take those past events into account when we eventually go to war against them. They do call the period between the Opium Wars and Mao's revolution the "Century of Humiliation" though, which sounds like something you don't simply forget.

The majority of white people are trash too. The historical facts I just mentioned are only two large-scale examples of it, out of God knows how many. The scant few actually good men and women we have around can and do come in all shapes and colors, just like the overwhelmingly more common bad ones.

Arabs Vs. Jews

I never cared much about Arab-Jewish issues until Hamas' infamous "October 7th Attack." I've only ever personally met one Jewish guy and one Arab, and the two of them were alright. I watched the wave of ISIS terrorist attacks in the US and Europe in the news as they happened, and I remember coming home from school, turning the TV on, and seeing the Twin Towers falling apart a hundred times over on 9/11. All of that made me morally side with the Israelis. But I eventually noticed how the United States bows to Israel's every whim, wondered why, and a couple of decades later finally managed to find the answer. Then I started reading about the issue of Palestine and, at long last, everything made some plausible sense.

All in all, I'd say I'm a fairly neutral party. Since neither Arabs nor Jews ever caused me any direct harm, I believe I'm able to assess the Middle Eastern "holy war" reasonably. Although I am by no means an expert in the subject, what follows is what I've learned from reading about their shared history (mainly the Jews') as well as from keeping up with the news during the most recent Israeli wars.

For starters, Jew and Arabs are *both* Semites. They descend from the people who, in ancient times, lived in the Middle East and parts of north and east Africa. Those people spoke Semitic languages, which included Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic, Akkadian and Amharic, among others. Using "antisemitism" to refer only to Jews is a *misappropriation*.

Likewise, both Judaism and Islam are Abrahamic religions. They are based on the same ancient texts and share many core principles and fables, with the Muslims even recognizing the Torah as a divine revelation. What happened, apparently, is that the Arabs and the Jews developed different *interpretations* of the exact same *lore*. And

it was these silly divergences that led to their historical, and now brutally violent, disagreements.

As a curiosity: according to Judaism, in Eden, Eve tempted Adam. According to Islam, it was Satan who tempted them both. And this is amusing, because while it is the Judaic version that puts the blame on women, it is the Muslims who, to this day, still discriminate against them.

Moving on: thousands of years ago, the Jewish People inhabited the Land of Israel (previously known as Canaan), which was comprised by the Northern Kingdom of Israel and Judea. The first of these two was invaded and conquered by the Assyrians in 722 BCE. The Jews refused to accept a foreign ruler, kept rebelling, conspired with the Assyrians' enemies, and ended up being expelled from the Northern Kingdom of Israel as a consequence. In 576 BCE, the Babylonians conquered Judea and, for the exact same reasons as the Assyrians', later ended up exiling many of the Jews who lived there to Babylon (note that the Bible itself describes both of those expulsions as *God's punishment* for the Jews, implying they *deserved* it). The Persians eventually took control of Judea, followed by the Greeks, and finally the Roman Empire.

The Romans had measures in place to assimilate into their empire the peoples they conquered (of course, since chaos would reign otherwise). All those who became their subjects were initially rebellious but, eventually, most of them settled down, adapted, and managed to exist somewhat peacefully as a part of the Roman Empire. Among the few exceptions were the Jews - these ones never ceased to revolt, leading a total of three armed rebellions against the Romans and being massacred on every occasion.

After the third Jewish insurgence, the Roman emperor realized the reasons behind their misbehavior were mainly religious: the Romans worshiped multiple Gods and the Jewish people wouldn't abide by anyone they deemed a pagan - even though they were allowed to freely practice their own religion, which means that the Jewish intent was to force their beliefs upon others. Upon becoming aware of that, the emperor destroyed Jerusalem and rebuilt it as a pagan Roman city, prohibited Jews from visiting it except for one day a year, banned Torah law and the Hebrew Calendar, executed Judaic scholars, and burned their sacred scrolls on the Temple Mount, just as he should.

The region of Judea was then left in ruins, forcing the Jews to migrate elsewhere. They were initially accepted in other Roman provinces but, with the rise of Christianity, they started being vilified, persecuted and expelled for “rejecting the true messiah (Jesus).” They were forced to move out of the empire, dispersing throughout the world. Meanwhile, the Roman Emperor merged the regions of Syria and Judea, renaming this new territory to “Syria Palaestina” (deliberately based on “Philistia,” some ancient enemies of the Jews). And by then, the territory of the Northern Kingdom of Israel had already been divided and incorporated into other Roman provinces.

Later on, during the Middle Ages, many Jews lived among Muslims in the Iberian Peninsula. There, they were considered *dhimmi* – “protected people” – under Islamic law. They had religious freedom and certain legal protections, while at the same time facing some social restrictions (they had to pay an extra tax, follow a particular dress code, and weren’t allowed to ride horses). Although when dynasties changed they were sometimes persecuted once again, for about seven hundred years the Jewish people thrived. They owned businesses, grew rich, and some even occupied official ranks within the government. Part of that period (10th to 12th century) is considered the Jews’ golden age (when they lived under *Muslim* rule!).

At around the same time and throughout a few centuries afterwards, many Jewish people were expelled from Spain (after this was formed), Portugal, England, France, Austria and the German States. That happened mostly due to religious disagreements, the Jews’ money-lending practices, and their isolationism. Their first *full* expulsion from an European country was determined by England in the year 1290.

Later on and much more recently, in the early 20th century, the British Empire ruled over Palestine (part of the former “Syria Palaestina”). In 1948, after managing the region had been causing them too much headache due to the severe attrition that had grown there between the local Palestinian population and the growing number of Jews inhabiting it, the British decided to forfeit their control over those lands. The UN suggested and pushed for a solution that would accommodate the many Jews who then lived there, which the Palestinians, of course, rejected. Civil war broke out, the Jewish people living in Palestine declared independence and, just like that, the state of Israel was born.

One day later, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq declared war on Israel. Jordan betrayed the other Arab countries, making a pact with the Jews and refusing to move its armies beyond Cisjordan (now “West Bank”). Egypt, whose forces were highly corrupt and extremely inept, was left to fight the Jewish insurgents alone, because Syria, Lebanon and Iraq sent only symbolic contingents of troops into the conflict. Thanks to the Arabs’ incompetence, stupidity, mutual distrust and underestimation of the Jews, coupled with the support these ones received from rich American [Jewish] citizens and from Stalin, that which might have been the easiest war ever fought in human history came to a stalemate. No side managed to come up victorious, and a ceasefire was established after a single year of combat.

Israel then proceeded to persecute and expel all Arabs from its newly-acquired territory, while the Arab nations did the same to the Jews in theirs. And the real *hatred* between Arabs and Jews was born then – less than a century ago.

Summing up:

- Jews and Muslims haven’t liked each other very much for a long time due to religious disagreements, but they managed to coexist in relative peace (without actually killing each other, at least);
- The Jewish People were expelled from their native lands multiple times due to their own fault, effectively losing them after causing too much trouble for the Roman Empire. The Palestinians are simply the people who have been living there ever since;
- The Jews had their best era while living under Muslim rule, in the Iberian Peninsula, during the Middle Ages;
- Around the same period, they were expelled from various European countries due to their intolerance, usury, and self-segregation;
- Later on, the Jewish population living in Palestine declared independence after Britain ceded its control of the region, creating the state of Israel;
- After the 1948 five Arab nations’ failed attempt to invade and occupy Israel right after it was born, the relationship between Jews and Arabs/Muslims soured, going from “minimally civilized tolerance” to “full blown genocidal hatred.”

And there you have it. Assuming I didn’t miss anything of major importance, their shared history is not that complicated.

Since I'm talking about the past, one more Jewish-related episode, although with no connection to Muslims, begs to be mentioned: *the Holocaust*.

Antisemitism has been a thing in Europe for a long time. From what I gathered, that's because, after the Jews spread throughout Europe, they formed ghettos and kept themselves isolated from the populations of all countries they moved to, sticking to their own culture, language and beliefs instead of adapting and adopting local ones; because their divergent religion kept generating attrition; and because, being restricted from owning lands or joining guilds, they focused on finance and money-lending to make a living, since the Torah allows them to freely take a *neshekh* ("a bite") from foreigners (they are prohibited from doing the same to other Jews). Keeping themselves isolated from local populations, forming their own communities and sticking to their own ways while in someone else's territory, refusing to adhere to more widely-spread religions (Christianity or Islam), and ripping off anyone who wasn't Jewish in their business transactions, the Jews became loathed everywhere they went. Then, based on this initial and perfectly justified antipathy, they were turned into a *scapegoat* as people started to blame them for anything bad that happened. Adding the real and the made up together, the global dislike for them kept growing.

Now let's get back to 1933 and the rise of Nazism.

Despite there being no particularly strong antisemitic feeling in 1930's Germany (it was by far the strongest in Romania, while being roughly the same in the rest of Europe), the Nazis decided to get rid of their entire Jewish population. They began to actively persecute Jews, implementing a series of antisemitic laws and doing everything they could to force Jewish people out of Germany.

In 1938, the delegates of thirty two countries met in France, during the Évian conference, to discuss ways to help the Jewish refugees trying to escape the Third Reich. *And no country was willing to take them in.* None of those thirty two countries – including the US and the UK – accepted to receive those refugees into their territories, except for one: the Dominican Republic. Most nations cited high unemployment, the Great Depression and local antisemitism as reasons for their refusals. Australia, in particular, famously noted that since they had "no real racial problem," they were not interested in "importing one."

Despite global condemnation of the Nazi antisemite laws and Jewish persecution, *no one* was actually willing to help them out. And just now, as I was fact-checking a few things, I learned that Hitler himself said *exactly* the same thing. So I have no option but to say that, in this particular case, he was right.

Only after the failure of the Évian conference did the Nazis start actually *killing* Jews.

You see, the Holocaust wasn't *entirely* caused by the Germans and, initially, it seems they had no intention of committing genocide. They were indeed responsible for persecuting and trying to expel Jews, but the death of millions of these was humanity's fault – humanity's, the Nazis' and, above all, the Jews', since antisemitism was and continues to be, once again, to a large extent justified. Everyone shares part of the guilt for the Holocaust.

I bet you never heard about the Évian conference before. I hadn't either. I accidentally found out about it in the first paragraphs of a paper written by William I. Brustein (West Virginia University) and Ryan. D. King (Ohio State University) called *Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust*.⁷ It took me a long time to finally run into that paper, because virtually everything that shows up on the internet about the Holocaust was written by Jews (an evidence that they continue to invest heavily in propaganda).

With all of that being said, the burning question is: who's to blame for antisemitism? Are the Jews truly as evil as they have historically been depicted, or are they indeed the victims they present themselves as?

As is usually the case, the truth is something in between.

The way I see it, the Jewish people deserved to be expelled by the Assyrians, the Babylonians and the Romans. And this is important, because it means *they lost* their homeland – it wasn't simply *taken from* them. Sticking to their divergent religion and to their own language while settling elsewhere and living among other people, not mingling with these, and ripping off non-Jewish people was also their *choice*. Wherever they moved to, Jewish people created and then started expanding a place of their own inside someone else's territory, essentially forming a black spot fueled by money unethically acquired from their hosts. Given the Jewish people's

⁷ **Source:**

https://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/73089/excerpt/9780521773089_excerpt.pdf
(Accessed in January, 2024)

rebellious history, that characterizes a direct, albeit veiled, assault on a country's sovereignty (as proven by how Israel itself was created, via stealing Palestinian territory) and an open disrespect to the people who accepted accommodating them. The Jews were not the victims. They were the criminals.

Regarding the antisemitic *treatment* the Jewish people received – as a consequence of their own actions – we are *led* to believe, by Jewish/Israeli propaganda, that it was unnecessarily harsh, brutal, cruel. Some of it was and, in my personal opinion, despite their faults what the Jews had to go through in concentration camps, in particular, was uncalled for, unfair and abhorrent. That was way too much. But generally speaking, they *were* the ones in the wrong, and those in the wrong not only ought to but *must* be punished. Since they couldn't possibly be *expelled* from Germany – given that, once again, no country on Earth would have them – and Germany itself didn't want and didn't *have* to accommodate them, a big problem arose, and a “final solution” was necessary. There was no way around it. Something *had* to be done. Had the Nazis executed all of their Jewish population, giving them a clean, painless death, I say they would have been right to do so. It would have been horrible, but there was no better way. But since they humiliated, starved and tortured the Jews instead, the Nazis were far “more wrong” than right, and what they did was, indeed, a tragedy.

In short, what we have so far is that the Jews deserve what we call “antisemitism.” The global dislike for Jews arose naturally, *everywhere* they went, because it's fair – they are [mostly] guilty as charged. But their crimes weren't grievous enough to earn them a punishment as brutal as the Holocaust.

Although the facts put the blame on the Jews themselves, there *is* one argument in their favor, which I can only see because I just had an epiphany: there is a reason, as well as merit, behind the Jewish behavior. This will be hard, but I'll try to make you see what I just suddenly realized.

Imagine you are a Jewish person in ancient times, living in the Land of Israel (Northern Kingdom plus Judea). Your lands are then invaded and your people conquered by a foreign enemy. You could continue living [mostly] as you were used to, knowing that such takeovers are common and that sooner or later another conqueror will show up, followed by others, none of which you'll have any fighting chance against. But no – instead you choose to rebel, which is understandable since you and your people want to rule yourselves,

like anyone else does. But your rioting backfires, and you end up being banished from parts of your homeland. Then you repeat the exact same mistake *twice* more, finally losing all the lands you once called your own. Now you are part of a people who has no place to live in, which makes keeping your *legacy* alive extremely difficult. And if your legacy dies, so does your people as such.

At that point, you are forced to migrate elsewhere. Then, you have two options. One is to *forfeit* your people's heritage, adapt to the culture of the population you choose to live among, incorporate their habits, reproduce with them, and let your children grow to be members and citizens of this other nation, becoming one of them. Your second option is to *resist* (or "to rebel," yet again). In this case, you move to another country but, since you want to keep your people's legacy alive, instead of mingling you segregate yourself. You reproduce only with other Jews, you teach your children Hebrew, and you pass down to them everything you can about your own people's history, culture, faith and traditions, to keep it all alive.

The Jewish people went with that second option. Can we blame them? Yes. Was it wise? Debatable. Was it easy? Definitely not.

And here's my point: all that the Jewish people had to go through in the past three thousand years, as well as everything they did that irked others, was done to *preserve their identity*. This is what shines about them: right or wrong, for better or worse, they won't let go of who they are, *no matter what*. Despite the dire consequences of that choice – for themselves and others – the moral principle behind it is admirable, as is the strength of their faith (which is what seems to have allowed them to persist). And given what the Jewish people had to endure, what they managed to survive, and the fact that they *did* succeed in keeping their identity alive after being scattered all over the world for thousands of years, it's hard not to feel a sense of reverence before their struggle.

The point, at the moment, is not whether what they did was right. This is about how much they fought for what they *thought* was. And isn't this the best any of us can do? To act upon what we *believe* is right?

The Jewish people probably fought for their beliefs harder than anyone else ever did, and for longer. This is what is, truly, beautiful about them and their history. I can see how much they endured, why, and thus the merit behind it. But was it worth it? Were they actually *right* in doing that?

No.

Do you know what is important about keeping one particular people's legacy alive, just for the sake of it? *Nothing*. Human culture, as a whole, is of utmost importance because, if all of our machinery rusts, all of our buildings collapse, and all of our books burn, together with our genes and the knowledge that remains within our individual minds our culture is all we ultimately have. Together, those three things represent everything we have ever achieved; they *define* us as a species.

But the whole Jewish culture, in particular and by itself, revolves around *religious* principles. That is not entirely without merit because the Torah, the Bible, and the *Al-Quran* are all based on the same texts which, in turn, are comprised in good part by ancient *philosophies* – they are not entirely made of nonsensical and absurd fables. But those philosophies were not perfect to start with and, being old, they are now also outdated. They do not incorporate anything of what we have learned since they were first considered, and they do not befit us because they are simply *wrong*. For instance, people from ages past assumed God was entirely focused on Earth, which we now know is only one planet, in a single solar system, part of a single galaxy in a universe filled with billions of them. If He created everything, then our planet is of no particular importance to Him, and neither are we. Those sacred texts also establish the Ten Commandments, six of which are completely absurd and all focusing on practical actions rather than on immutable moral principles. They are deeply flawed, and following them certainly won't lead us to Heaven, but rather in the opposite direction. The Jewish creed, in particular, follows six hundred and thirteen *mitzvot* instead, but these are all based on those same Ten Commandments, which means that, regardless of the Jewish legacy and its very people surviving or not, their misguided ethos still would. And what is relevant about a people and their culture if not the *moral basis* they adhere to? Once again: nothing.

Being based on outdated and misleading philosophical concepts mixed with poorly recorded history (lore) and surreal fantasies (created to assign meaning to things we couldn't logically explain in ancient times), the Jewish culture does not follow reason and it does not recognize reality as it is. And everything that is irrational and untruthful is harmful. As such, the Jewish creed and culture must not only *not* be protected, but it has to be destroyed instead (as much of the entire human culture should).

Many people have been exterminated in the past, including entire hominid species like the *Homo floresiensis*, the *Homo luzonensis*, and the *Homo naledi*. Today, we might have been better off with some of their genes and habits, following some of their ancient beliefs and traditions, or we might have been worse. There's no telling for sure since that didn't actually happen and, to us, now, it doesn't matter at all. And the same goes for the Jewish legacy: if it ceased to exist, it wouldn't change anything for the rest of humanity. *If* it's demise did change something, it would be for the better – and this is not just theoretical since, knowing what the Jewish struggle to keep their legacy alive led to in the last three thousand years, and what it continues to through Israel and its agents spread all over the world, there's no doubt about it.

Exclusively to prevent their particular culture from dying, the Jewish people went through great lengths and ultimately affected us all – *negatively*.

So, here's what I ultimately conclude from the Jewish history: to protect principles that shouldn't be protected and that would have mostly survived just the same without them, the Jews rebelled multiple times, were fairly expelled from their homelands for doing so, and then moved on to antagonize all other peoples they lived among, disrespecting other cultures and creeds, causing myriad problems for themselves and others. We must acknowledge they fought very hard for what they believe in, but their beliefs are wrong and whatever good is in them seems to only apply to the Jews themselves, such as in the previously mentioned "you can't rip off Jews, but you are free to do it to anyone else" case, which indicates that Judaism's core precepts segregate the Jewish people from the rest of humanity, as if they were special and the rest of us beneath them. Finally, had the Jews failed to keep their legacy alive, this wouldn't have made any difference for the rest of us, for humanity as a whole. But they succeeded and, in doing so, Israel was created – which is now the only actual *terrorist state* on the planet.

The Jewish people battled for thousands of years and endured a lot of suffering just to make life *worse* for all of us.

I can respect and even admire their struggle, but I cannot agree with or condone it in good conscience.

Let's move on to the current state of affairs, so that I can justify why I called Israel "a terrorist state." From now on, keep in mind that "Israelis" and "Jews" are two different things. That is important, because there are big differences between what an Israeli and other Jews defend, between how they are raised, what they seek, how they act and, as a consequence, in who they *are*.

After being officially recognized (by some) as a state, Israel quickly managed to economically and militarily surpass all of its Arab neighbors combined. But *how* exactly they did so brings the question "Why is the United States Israel's bitch?" back into focus. I found the answer to that in a 2006 paper written, once again, by two American professors - John J. Maerscheimer (University of Chicago) and Stephen M. Walt (Harvard University) - titled *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*⁸ (a must-read for Americans).

The answer itself is: Israel has the strongest or second strongest (depending on whom you ask) lobbying group(s) in the United States, being ahead even of America's own and legitimate pro-gun movements. Israel also has a lot of agents infiltrated in Capitol Hill who pressure, intimidate, threaten, sue, persecute, and indirectly arrest, torture and physically assault anyone who has anything to say about Israel that this one doesn't like or doesn't want others to know. The Israelis are violent bullies who censor college professors, brainwash students, force people to be fired, induce the police to beat up peaceful protesters, manipulate politicians and utilize every other immoral means they can fathom to make sure Israel is always seen as "the good guy" as well as an important ally to the United States (which, according to the paper mentioned above, it doesn't seem to be). According to Donald Trump's own words, spoken during an interview given to The Daily Caller in September, 2025, "Israel was the strongest lobby I've ever seen. They had *total control* over Congress." (In the past tense because, at the time that interview was given, Israel lobbying groups were losing some power due to their country's conduct in Gaza generating widespread disapproval.)

The Israelis use pretty much the same tactics communists use to take over a country, but with a different goal: instead of aiming to enslave an entire population and steal everything it has, Israel aims to be able to wage war for free (at the US' expense) while making the entire world back up *anything* they do (following the US's lead), however immoral, violent and repugnant it may be.

⁸ **Downloadable at:** <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/publications/israel-lobby-and-us-foreign-policy> (Accessed in January, 2024)

Pay attention to how quickly the term “antisemitic” shows up when anyone says a word about Jews, and to how often it implies “Arrest them immediately!” (reactions directly encouraged and sponsored by Israel, but not necessarily the global Jewish community). It comes up in a fraction of a second, even faster than the terms “racist” and “homophobic” do when you say anything about black or gay people that they don’t like, *regardless of how true it is*. That’s a tool of censorship, used identically in all of those cases to impose those peoples’ wills upon the rest of us, curtailing our legitimate freedom of speech (later followed by more rights) in an attempt to sweep their misdeeds under the rug and, more importantly, ensure that they can continue to perpetrate them.

Although that paper I most recently mentioned was written in 2006, Israel keeps using the exact same tactics to this day. If anything, its agents are even more infiltrated in American politics than they ever were before, and its ministers have become bold enough to openly insult and attempt to censor even European politicians and the UN’s secretary-general. Israel completely disregards international law and the ICJ’s rulings, publicly attacking any political figure who “dares” to condemn their openly racist (anti-Arabic) ideology and genocidal intentions. In 2024 alone, Israeli lobbying groups in the United States planned to (and I assume went ahead with it) spend US\$100 million to *unseat* American politicians who openly criticized Israel’s conduct in its Gaza massacre. It’s not even a covert operation anymore, because Israel realized people knowing or not about its crimes makes no difference, since its American puppets won’t allow anyone to utter a word, much less lift a finger against it.

The Jews who created Israel and then solidified its position were smart. Instead of fending for themselves, they focused on making the world’s largest economy, military and technological power do their bidding. Rather than fighting their own battles, they make the United States do it in their stead. Do you know what justified the US’s invasion of Iraq?

[*Forged*] Israeli intelligence.

The Israelis knew perfectly well Iraq had no nuclear weapons, but nonetheless fooled the Americans into believing it did, manipulating the US into directly defeating one of their enemies for them. And they recently did the same thing again in Iran, leading Uncle Sam to directly bomb that country’s nuclear-enrichment sites by claiming Khamenei was “weeks away from developing a nuclear weapon” while the US’s own intelligence services – all eighteen of them

combined – concluded, prior to the attack, that Iran was still at least *three years* away from doing so (more than long enough to find a peaceful, diplomatic and longer-lasting solution). And a little later, following Israel's command, the US openly declared war against Iran and began directly assassinating its people. In Iran's case the US wasn't misled though, instead just having been given the lamest of excuses to do what it's government (Trump, his family and friends) actually wanted. *If* it indeed wasn't the case in Iraq's war, in Iran's the United States' government was, without any doubt, entirely aware of what it was doing and fully complicit in Israel's crimes.

Not only have "American lives" (as the Americans themselves like to put it, as if theirs were worth more than everyone else's) been lost thanks to Israeli manipulation but, to this day, the US has also provided Israel with US\$300 billion in foreign assistance⁹. And that's actually funny, because it means Israel uses [just a] part of the money given to them *by* the United States to manipulate the United States into working *for* them.

Slick, huh?

If you are American, keep in mind that, whenever you hear your government telling you *anything* about the Middle East, what it says comes *straight* from Israel, completely bent out of shape whenever necessary to fulfill that country's needs and not yours, and always treated as true by people in your government but on their payroll (or blackmailing list).

Let's dive into "The Question of Palestine."

At the moment, we have millions of Palestinians forcefully removed from their lands while "settlers" – Israelis who violently invade and proceed to illegally live inside the West Bank, murdering people and destroying their homes while being directly protected by IDF (Israel Defense Forces) soldiers, with Israel's government's full support and the open intent of forcing the local population out – occupy a good part of what little is officially left of it. When the Palestinians do anything to try to get back what was criminally taken from them, the Western World echoes Israel's voice in unison, calling *them* "terrorists." But just like the Israelis believe those disputed lands belong to the Jews, the Palestinians believe just as earnestly they are theirs instead. Both sides equally believe what they are fighting for is

⁹ **Source:** <https://www.cfr.org/article/us-aid-israel-four-charts> (Accessed in January, 2024)

right, and they both have their reasons to think so, which *justifies* past Palestinian “terrorist” actions – those were not acts of terrorism, but simply the only means those people had to fight for themselves. Without an army of their own and a solid economy, without the Western support the Israelis have, while under American sanctions and permanently besieged by Israel, the Palestinians cannot fight an actual war, having instead to rely on isolated acts of violence to try to achieve their goals, draw attention to their own struggle, and enact some level of justice.

As I said when I wrote about the historical past of Jews and Arabs, the first ones were officially accepted and treated with at least a minimum of respect when they lived under Muslim rule, and they *thrived*. So we ought to ask ourselves: how are things now for the Palestinians, when the situation is reversed?

Currently, the Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank live under illegal Israeli occupation. They are subject to Israel’s laws and will, not to their own. And among other things I’ve seen, a video made by *The Guardian* about the water situation in the West Bank painted a good picture of how the Israelis have been treating the Palestinians for the past eighty years.

When Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat signed the Oslo Accords, an “*equitable use* of shared water resources” was agreed upon (Article 40 of the Oslo II Accord). Nonetheless, Israel retained its previously established control over the most productive aquifer in the region, as well as the power to veto any and all Palestinian projects related to water extraction. Whenever the Palestinian people try to extract water on their own – which is probably always vetoed by Israel – the Israelis destroy their wells or drilling rigs and arrest the people building or operating them. Israel keeps 87% of the water extracted from that aquifer for itself, leaving 13% to the Palestinians who are then forced to *purchase* part of the water they need to survive back from those who stole it from them.

On average, an Israeli lives with 247 liters of water per day, while a Palestinian lives with 80 liters (the WHO recommends a minimum of 100 liters/day per person). While the Palestinians living in the West Bank have barely enough water to cook and flush their toilets, and can only [quickly] shower once every few days, the settlers next-door are given enough to grow their own crops and even raise cattle.

After the Israel-Hamas war began and the IDF immediately established a siege around Gaza, shutting down all water, food, fuel

and electric supply to it, the Palestinians were living with 2-3 liters of water a day. And most of it was salty or sewage water.

If someone invaded your home, murdered your entire family, stole everything you had, locked you in the bathroom, and then refused to give even a minimally acceptable amount of your own water back to you, wouldn't you rightfully hate them too?

It's not only hard, but in fact impossible to blame the Palestinians for their rage and the violence that emanates from it. And that water issue is just the tip of the iceberg.

Let me quote an excerpt from that American paper I previously mentioned (*The Israel Lobby and American Foreign Policy*):

Israeli personnel have tortured numerous Palestinian prisoners, systematically humiliated and inconvenienced Palestinian civilians, and used force indiscriminately against them on numerous occasions. During the First Intifada (1987-1991), for example, the IDF distributed truncheons to its troops and encouraged them to break the bones of Palestinian protestors. The Swedish "Save the Children" organization estimated that "23,600 to 29,900 children required medical treatment for their beating injuries in the first two years of the intifada," with nearly one-third sustaining broken bones. Nearly one-third of the beaten children were aged ten and under.

Israel's response to the Second Intifada (2000-2005) has been even more violent, leading Ha'aretz to declare that "the IDF ... is turning into a killing machine whose efficiency is awe-inspiring, yet shocking." The IDF fired one million bullets in the first days of the uprising, which is far from a measured response. Since then, Israel has killed 3.4 Palestinians for every Israeli lost, the majority of whom have been innocent bystanders; the ratio of Palestinian to Israeli children killed is even higher (5.7 to 1). Israeli forces have also killed several foreign peace activists, including a 23 year-old American woman crushed by an Israeli bulldozer in March 2003.

Twenty years later, nothing has changed. Do you remember when ISIS went around decapitating people? Yeah - the Israelis aren't any better. I can't say for sure, but I have a feeling that they are the ones who actually *started* this trend of extreme brutality. And if so, that makes it fair for the Arabs to treat them the same way, or even worse.

If you are aware of the recent Israel-Hamas “war” (more like “slaughter”), you know the Israelis kept bombing numerous civilians to hit a handful of Hamas combatants (*if* any, in many cases). It was disproportionate, thousands of war crimes were committed, the whole world complained about it (though no one had the balls to aver, “Yes, they are clearly committing genocide”), and the Israelis didn’t give a damn, because there were still *zero* consequences for them – the US, the UK and others kept uninterruptedly sending them armaments, allowing Israel to violate any and all international laws, treaties and moral principles at will.

Fun fact: some scientists researched the amount of CO₂ released in Earth’s atmosphere thanks to the Israel-Hamas conflict. According to an article by *The Guardian*, “Almost half the total CO₂ emissions were down to US cargo planes flying military supplies to Israel (...) The flights guzzled around 50m litres of aviation fuel, spewing an estimated 133,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere”¹⁰ And that was only in the first *two months* of war.

Anyway, the fact that the IDF was deliberately targeting civilians, humanitarian aid convoys, refugee camps, residences, hospitals, schools, journalists, etc. got me wondering: *why* were they doing that? Such unrestrained mass-killing was completely unnecessary. Israel could easily send troops in on the ground, sparing thousands of Palestinian civilian lives at the expense of just a few of its own soldiers’. There’s no solid argument for not doing so – soldiers lives are *meant* to be spent, especially when you lose one for every hundred you kill. That would have been “the path of least suffering.” Massacring the Palestinians was bound to lead to them hating the Israelis even more, and rightfully so, for a very long time if not forever. Why would Israel *want* that?

A Yale professor (whose name I didn’t capture) answered that one for me, in a news article and while the war was still raging, before I managed to infer it on my own. The man said Israel was, indeed, doing it on purpose. His theory, which I agree with, is that Israel had been slaughtering the Palestinians so that these ones would *not* support the “two-state solution” defended by the rest of the world – if the Palestinians aren’t willing to share any of their territory with Israel, if they do not support the UN’s plan and no diplomatic solution can possibly be found, the Israelis then have an *excuse* to keep abusing and killing them. Israel’s plan is to make the entire

¹⁰ **Source:** <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2024/jan/09/emissions-gaza-israel-hamas-war-climate-change> (Accessed in March, 2024)

world believe the Palestinians are the ones to blame for the lack of a peaceful solution or, in more practical terms, to allow Western politicians to feed such a lie to their own citizens, so that the US, the UK and members of the EU can keep officially financing Israel's genocidal endeavors and guaranteeing its impunity.

Concomitantly, we have the fact that Israel doesn't want to share a single inch of "Canaan" with the Palestinians or anyone else. Its goal is clearly to acquire all of it, and Netanyahu's cabinet barely bothers trying to hide this anymore. The Zionists are hell bent on getting rid of the Palestinians, and if these ones can't be forced to leave, Israel seems to have every intention of killing them all - exactly like the Nazis once did to the Jews themselves. All that's stopping them (for now) is widespread popular condemnation, which at least still seems to bother some Western leaders a *little* bit.

At some point, Israel in fact drew a plan to build a "humanitarian city" in Gaza, meant to accommodate all the Palestinian population. But they didn't go ahead with it because no one on Earth could tell the difference between that and a *concentration camp*. Pictures from such a place would make it hard for certain politicians to convince their electorates that "those dirty, skinny, starving, sick and crying people sitting on a pile of dead children behind that barbed-wired fence have never been happier!" (read that as a fully-capitalized tweet if you will). The Israelis do have prisons filled with Palestinian women, children and a bunch of people who were never trialed, though. They are missing the gas chambers, but torture is systemic and systematic, Palestinian prisoners are beaten up, humiliated and sodomized, and mass graves have long been dug and filled.

To give you some insight into how Israel conducted itself during its war against Gaza:

- They killed about fifty journalists in less than two months of combat;
- They deliberately fired at several ambulances, prohibited these from reaching victims in need of rescue (once leading to the death of a little girl who was left trapped for days in a car alone with the dead bodies of her family), and shot or bombed several humanitarian aid convoys as well;
- Israeli soldiers murdered three of their own hostages captured by Hamas in cold blood. They ran into the three men (who were unarmed, holding a white flag and yelling in Hebrew) inside Gaza and simply fired at them. The last surviving

- hostage tried to run for safety, so the IDF fired a second salvo to make sure he died;
- The vast majority of the other hostages who actually died were killed by Israel's own indiscriminate bombings (I've read about only *one* exception: a Hamas member executed a hostage because the IDF had bombed his home, killing his entire family, a day before);
 - Israeli snipers murdered people inside hospitals' ICUs, women running for shelter inside churches, and their troops have invaded a hospital in disguise to assassinate patients inside;
 - They also sniped people entering emergency rooms, and were once shooting, with drones, *anyone* who moved inside a hospital;
 - IDF soldiers stripped Palestinian men naked and paraded them in the middle of the streets;
 - They were filmed executing unarmed men;
 - Taking advantage of the war and still fully backed by Israel's government, settlers kept attacking and expelling thousands of Palestinians from their homes in the West Bank, at an even faster pace than usual (and the curious thing is that, according to an article I read at some point during the war, the most violent settlers had dual Israeli-American citizenship – some Jewish-American psychos took advantage of the war to enjoy some murder-tourism);
 - The IDF used an AI to identify potential targets, which led to about 70% of all buildings in the City of Gaza being razed to the ground, many entire families being killed at once inside their homes, 2,000 pound bombs being dropped on refugee camps, safe-zones (so declared by the IDF) filled with refugees being targeted multiple times, and to about 70% of the war casualties being comprised by women and children. So either Israel's AI is absolutely retarded, or they *configured* it for genocide;
 - IDF soldiers routinely used Palestinian people as human shields;
 - They deliberately targeted and killed seven American, British, Canadian and Australian aid workers inside a car perfectly identified as a humanitarian-aid vehicle;
 - When they briefly invaded Lebanon to whup Hezbollah, they fired multiple times at UN troops "peacekeeping" in between the two countries' territories, injuring a total of seven (if I'm not mistaken) international peacekeepers. They also destroyed

every single camera installed on the UN bases (it's not hard to infer why);

- Along with the USA, for several months they monopolized the distribution of aid inside Gaza and, for as long as they did, they murdered Palestinians waiting in line to get food (firing at them with tanks even) every single day, leaving people with only two options: to starve to death or line up to be orderly executed (in the first 60 days, 859 people were murdered in the Israeli-American "humanitarian slaughterhouses" and 4,891 more wounded);
- Microsoft, Google and Amazon hosted cloud services for the IDF, directly contributing to the genocide in Gaza. (Microsoft had to back out though, after an investigative report by *The Guardian* and others backed it into a corner and it could no longer pretend it knew nothing about what the IDF was using Azure for. Google and Amazon kept profitably pretending);
- The IDF fired a missile at a fertility clinic inside a hospital in Gaza, destroying 4,000 frozen embryos. The tanks that kept those alive were directly and precisely hit, in an attack that reflects undeniable genocidal intentions (the IDF must have surely claimed somewhere that those were "armed combatants" and thus "legitimate military targets");
- A number of IDF soldiers have come out (some on the record) to blow the whistle on how they were given carte blanche to indiscriminately kill anyone in Gaza without reason or consequences. They were in fact encouraged to do so, including by rabbis;
- According to documents leaked directly from the Israeli military intelligence, 83% of those murdered by the IDF in Gaza were civilians;
- The IDF violated every single one of the multiple "ceasefires" it signed with Hamas, hundreds of times.

All of that was fully and unconditionally backed by the United States.

A few other isolated facts are also worth mentioning to further demonstrate how Israelis act and some consequences of it.

Fact one: at some point during the war, an Israeli soccer team went to the Netherlands for a match. For some reason, the local population started attacking the Israeli fans. The news called the Dutch "antisemitic" and many of them were arrested. On the following day, Amsterdam's chief of police explained what actually happened: the Israelis were going over the streets chanting "All

Arabs must die” and things of the sort, vandalizing parked cars and tearing up Palestinian flags they found hanging around. Seeing that, a throng of good and decent Dutch folks attacked them.

A total of sixty-two people were arrested, ten of them Israeli. These were all fined and quickly released, with the exception of one who was charged with vandalism and incitement. Out of the Dutch, five got prison terms. One of them was convicted of “antisemitism,” while no Israeli was even *charged* with the same (since “antisemitism,” semantically, must apply to Arabs as well).

That’s what a 21st century, first-world European country calls “justice.”

Fact two: two American contractors working at GHF’s “aid distribution” sites (the “human slaughterhouses”) in Gaza spoke out on how Israel gave weapons to untrained men and told them to abuse, humiliate, maim and murder any Palestinian who came to them seeking food. They related how the Israelis, as well as American mercenaries, laughed as they threw stun grenades, pepper-sprayed and shot at trapped starving Palestinian civilians.

Fact three: on February 25, 2024, Aaron Bushnell, an active-duty member of the USAF, committed suicide by setting himself on fire in front of the Israeli embassy in Washington D.C. in protest against what was being done in Gaza. In his Facebook “suicide post,” he wrote:

“Many of us like to ask ourselves, ‘What would I do if I was alive during slavery? Or the Jim Crow South? Or apartheid? What would I do if my country was committing genocide?’ The answer is, you’re doing it. Right now.(...) I will no longer be complicit in genocide... I am about to engage in an extreme act of protest, but compared to what people have been experiencing in Palestine at the hands of their colonizers, it’s not extreme at all.”

Aaron left all his savings for the Palestine Children’s Relief Fund in his will. On September 11, 2024, Matt Nelson did the same thing, in Boston. He mentioned Gaza before the act. And prior to them both, in December 1st, 2023, an unidentified woman self-immolated in Atlanta wrapped in a Palestinian flag.

That’s the kind of emotion and action Israel’s disturbing conducts stir in people with a conscience.

Fact four: Greta Thunberg (I'm not a fan of her, but maybe she's not as bad as I thought), along with several other activists, sailed a boat filled with humanitarian aid to Gaza in a symbolic attempt to "try" to breach Israel's blockade of it. As expected, they were intercepted in international waters by the IDF (technically, in an act of piracy), mocked, mistreated and mildly abused. The crew were all released within a few days.

A couple of months later, a second boat tried to do the same. This one didn't receive nearly as much media coverage, so the IDF beat everyone in it up, humiliated and tortured some of them, and took longer to release its crew.

Prior to those two events, in 2010, one other lonely boat had tried to do the same thing, while no war was going on and the media didn't give a damn about it. These ones were shot at thirty times before being boarded, and five of the people aboard were executed on the spot by the IDF, with point-blank shots to the head.

Though the Jews survived the horrors of the Holocaust, doing so seems to have taught the Israelis, in particular, only two lessons: how to do the same to other people and how to get away with it. Globally, Israel has tested humanity's morality and, as a species, we have failed with flying colors. Out of fear of the United States, every nation on Earth (with the exception of those the Americans themselves have dubbed "terrorists") has refused to move a finger to try to stop Israel. On top of that, countries of the collective West have also adopted censorship and physical violence to silence their *own* citizens who dare to call out crimes of war and against humanity for what they are: genocide. And not only genocide – which in itself is not necessarily a bad thing, since some people must indeed go – but genocide via *mass torture*, which is downright cruel and the utmost manifestation of everything we should strive to avoid.

The most disturbing thing about all of this is that Israel's warfare mentality is not just a "Netanyahu's thing," but in fact an endemic mindset – it represents the *collective will* of its population. Since every Israeli person is brainwashed since birth to hate Arabs, fed propaganda in school, forced to spend two years of their lives serving the IDF, and this one is mostly formed by average Israeli citizens during times of war, how Israel's soldiers act is a direct representation of how Israelis in general think and act. An IDF soldier is a *direct* representation of who an Israeli is. And they are vile, cruel and psychopathic people.

Much of Israel's government is comprised by Zionists, which are those among the Jews who actually *act* upon their religious fantasies, climbing to power and dedicating their entire lives to destroying other people's. By believing they, and they alone, were chosen by God, Zionists think the entire world belongs to them and everyone else in it is irrelevant. They believe the rest of humanity is comprised by cockroaches who exist exclusively to do their bidding and, consequently, that they can treat anyone who stands in the way of their selfish and greedy whims as such. They make use of any strategies and tactics they can fathom, regardless of how immoral these may be and of how many people they may harm, because they have convinced themselves that they are *entitled* to.

The Israel that current exists is the result of such people doing as they please. Those who live there seem to have been raised and now exist *to* enact misguided vengeance and inflict disproportionate pain rather than to create and secure a place where Jews may live in peace. Under the Zionists' guidance, at some point the Israelis completely lost their compass, crossed a series of red lines and, once this happens, it's hard to reorient the first and move back over the second. Once people embrace evil and get a taste of blood, all they want is an endless supply of it.

Historically speaking, Jews have been a problem for many, for a very long time. But Jewish usury is no longer an issue, since governments now set interest rates and loans can be taken in any bank (some of the largest ones are, of course, still owned and run by Jews though). The fact that Jewish people segregate themselves from others is nearly irrelevant compared to the issues created by other groups of immigrants who now have spread and multiplied throughout first-world countries. They are hardly ever used as scapegoats anymore, because we can now explain virtually anything that happens and we [mostly] know who or what to properly blame for any of it. We've grown a little more enlightened, and I doubt anyone still harshly antagonizes them due to their religious beliefs (also, doing so is now considered a hate crime in most Western countries). Thus, most of the reasons why they were justifiably despised in the past have ceased to exist. Nowadays, all *serious* problems caused by Jews have one and the same source: Israel.

All of the practices Jewish people adopted that led to their historical discrimination were taken to protect their legacy and ethnic identity, and after thousands of years, much struggle and a lot of suffering, they did succeed in keeping it alive. Albeit no one is better for their

efforts and they also had to resort to unhinged cruelty, they did manage to steal a place of their own where they can now live in, shielded by American power and a few undeserved nuclear warheads. They are not entirely safe though, as the bloody birth of Israel ignited a seemingly endless war. Yes – the Jews probably had no other (non-violent) means to achieve their goal and, if we admit they should have a place of their own, they are entitled to defend it. But the Israelis didn't have to treat the Palestinians like animals, to raze the entirety of Gaza to the ground, to kidnap and/or assassinate hundreds of journalists and doctors, to kill dozens of thousands of children, to lie about everything they do, etc., etc., etc. They also didn't have to infiltrate other governments as deeply as they have, to manipulate these into silencing and beating their own peoples, to hunt down anyone who disagrees with them or to legally threaten entire populations with antisemitism to cover up their tracks and crimes. This is precisely what should now generate legitimate, well-earned antisemitism.

Israel believes its people were chosen by God Himself, that their way is the only one, that the whole world belongs to them, and that anyone who disagrees should burn (any similarity with American doctrines is "mere coincidence"). But hatred begets hatred, and if Israel doesn't stop harming others the *whole* Jewish community won't stop being discriminated against.

The Israelis could have tried to see and take into account the Palestinians' perspective. They could have compromised, settled for a fair amount of land and stabilized the region. If they truly want peace, as they constantly pretend to, they ought to start admitting diverging opinions, respecting international principles and institutions, and to stop meddling in other countries' businesses, censoring, manipulating and killing people. They ought to start making friends instead of cultivating ancient enmities, to at least try to be liked instead of continuing to be hated. But peace is not what Israel wants – what it wants is *more*: more lands, more power, more blood.

The good people among the Jews probably never meant for Israel to turn out as the unmitigated disaster it is; for things to happen as they did. I doubt they want so much blood in their hands, and they certainly don't want such absurd levels of cruelty enacted in their name (many of them have stated so aloud). But, to Israel, the global Jewish community seems to matter just as much as prisoners of war or its own hostages: not at all.

Despite everything I've said so far, this whole "Arabs Vs. Jews" issue still remains somewhat morally ambiguous. The past is one thing and the present another; some ancient principles are still valid, while many aren't; any end can only justify certain means; not only what one does to get what they want matters, but also what they do once they get it; "Jews" and "Israelis" are not the same thing, and they shouldn't be treated equally. So, in conclusion, I'd say *good* Jews deserve a land of their own, while Israelis *don't*.

Israel must revisit its goals and ideals. So far, all it has achieved has been to do the world – including the global Jewish community – a huge *disservice*. So long as we, peoples of Earth, treat each other fairly we can all share this big lump of dirt, and the Jewish people are welcome to a place in it. But none of us has to share it with those among them who are not willing to share it with us.

Given what its people have become, Israel cannot be allowed to exist as it is. Nothing has been made better by it, and probably nothing ever will.

Now focusing specifically on the *land dispute* between Israel and Palestine, we have the first losing its territory thousands of years ago and the second one being established there ever since. So we ought to ask: who has the most *legitimate claim* to those lands?

The Jews believe the whole "Land of Israel" (Israel plus Gaza, the West Bank, parts of Lebanon, Jordan and Syria) belongs to them because it *used to* and because, according to the Torah, that land was *promised to them by God*. Yes – many of them actually [pretend to] believe that: once again, the so-called "Zionists."

The Palestinians, on the other hand, didn't steal those lands from anyone; they didn't *harm* anybody for it. They have lived there peacefully for the past thousands of years because the lands had no owner, and thus, with the Roman Empire's blessing, they settled in it. (Or they were just the people who already lived there but were not Jewish; same effect.)

Since the Jews lost their lands due to their own fault, they don't have the "previous owner" claim. Expelling them from their homeland was not just understandable, but fair (if not *merciful*). The Romans could easily have exterminated all of their Jewish population if they wanted to, but they refrained from doing so.

Israel's second claim is that God supposedly promised that whole arid corner of the planet to its people, but this one is obviously null and void since it's nothing but a made-up fairy tale.

Still, the Jews do have a third, valid and "hidden" claim to the "Land of Israel," which is based on the fact that, given all they had to go through for thousands of years, we *may* say they deserve a country of their own. And where could that country be, if not on the lands that once belonged to them? The Jews did everything they could to maintain their ethnic identity alive through Diaspora and Holocaust alike, meriting a home. But it could be argued that all the harm they've caused has "un-merited" it, and we cannot simply steal some unrelated people's lands and give it to them. Thus, we have a problem indeed. How the hell do we solve it?

Trying to fix the Israeli-Palestinian issue, the global community has spent decades pushing for a "two-state" solution. That is the simplest and most obvious course of action: "Let's divide the territory in two, then give half to each interested party." But things aren't so simple, because that wouldn't be fair to anyone. *Ideally*, every Israeli should be killed and the rest of the Jews on Earth should be given the lands of Gaza and the West Bank, or perhaps even the whole ancient region of Canaan. Then, a non-existent, hypothetical territory nearby, larger than Gaza and the West Bank combined, would have to exist for us to accommodate the Palestinians in. That's how to make everyone happy and, obviously, also not an option (not without divine intervention and a proper tectonic shift, but God doesn't seem to care about any of this). The "two-state" is a "hey-at-least-we-got-something" compromise that doesn't satisfy anyone. Still, by now the Palestinians are probably willing to forfeit their unachievable dreams and settle for a total area equal to the one they currently inhabit plus *peace*, which leaves only Israel unsatisfied. But for this one to be happy it needs to conquer the whole Palestine, plus parts of Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon - which entails a few more centuries of war, many millions of lives destroyed, and millions more forcefully relocated and misplaced.

It's a pickle. But I have an idea.

Middle Eastern nations could all work together to geographically re-divide the region. Since Israel's desired goal is to obtain territories from Gaza, the West Bank, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria; this one, Iraq and Saudi Arabia have plenty of land they don't need; and they all want peace, they could give Israel *part* of what it wants, pacifying it. A new territory could be established to allocate the Palestinians,

nearby and akin to the one they are used to, also from lands ceded by those three larger countries. In exchange for so many Arab concessions, Israel would be responsible for the entire construction of “New Palestine.” By building it, Israel would be paying for all the material damage it caused to the Palestinians, while also creating something far better than what these ones were used to. By doing this, Israel would drastically improve the Palestinians’ quality of life, making up, insofar as possible, for the emotional damage caused (killings, starvation, humiliation, etc.). That would leave us with two satisfied, winning parties: Israel and Palestine. The tricky part is compensating Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Iraq and Saudi Arabia for the territories they ceded.

Lebanon’s, Jordan’s and Syria’s borders could be redrawn to compensate for what they lost, leaving Iraq and Saudi Arabia as the only losers. These two would get lasting peace, but this wouldn’t be enough for them because everyone else would also get the same. At this point, we’d have to resort to myriad concessions and benefits, since territorial ones wouldn’t be an option. Sanctions could be lifted, trade agreements could be established, technologies could be shared, and investments could be made by Israel’s wealthy and complacent allies to appease Iraq and Saudi Arabia. Maybe the world could help these countries overhaul their entire economies, since their oil reserves will eventually dry out, leaving them with little left to live by.

The “two-state” solution doesn’t satisfy anyone, and unsatisfied parties keep killing each other. Mine, or a variation of it, has a chance of doing the trick. The only problem is *negotiating* it (for God’s sake, just don’t ask *Trump* to try and do this).

At long last, as I had previously been focusing on ethnicity, races and cultures, here we have two of them.

On one side, we have the Jewish people.

These Semite folks were once rebellious and rigorously intolerant of other people’s beliefs, and they lost their lands as punishment for it. Spread throughout the world, they did what they had to do to keep their ethnic identity alive, constantly irking others in the process. After nearly three thousand years, they finally managed to violently reacquire a part of their lost lands, creating the state of Israel and enraging many millions of Arabs. To defend their newborn nation,

guided by Zionist hands they brainwashed themselves into becoming sociopathic killing machines and then started adopting means of a questionable nature, which quickly became limitlessly immoral, insidious and sadistic.

Jews in general are one thing, while Israelis are another. The latter are grown and raised under the influence of propaganda, developing a deep, blind rage for Arabs before they spend a couple of years training to put it into practice. Though the original intention was for Jews to have a safe place on Earth to live peacefully in, the actual result was the creation of an actual terrorist state, since Israel now exists *to* infiltrate foreign governments, manipulate other populations and steal territory; to threaten, scare, maim and kill men, women and children, combatants and civilians alike.

It must be said that many among the global Jewish community have condemned Israel's conduct during its war against the Palestinians. On many occasions and in several different countries, Jewish people protested against Israel's besiege-starve-and-slaughter strategy and let-no-child-live tactics (even some *Orthodox* Jews were once stomping Israel's flag in protest). The Israelis are inhuman, but we cannot generalize that to all Jews.

Zionists in Israel's government – Netanyahu and his goons – are mentally sick people. They have no boundaries, no manners, no respect for anything. They openly insult UN representatives, foreign politicians and dignitaries, attempting to censor anyone who criticizes their conduct by accusing people of antisemitism to the point where I'd say we'd all be far better off by abandoning the word, its concept, and its legal consequences altogether (in fact, I have no doubt whatsoever we should do this).

The Jewish dream is to reacquire the whole "Land of Israel," which nowadays encompasses Israel, Gaza, the West Bank, parts of Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. And Israel has been constantly expanding, with Gaza being only the latest step in this thieving endeavor alongside the incessant and brutal "settlement" of the West Bank. Under the Zionists, Israel will keep murdering people and stealing lands until its ancient kingdom is reestablished. Dozens of millions more will be tortured and killed if it's not stopped. And much like Russia in Ukraine, who's to say Israel will stop there, once that initial objective has been achieved? Human nature, history and reason all dictate it won't.

There may even be a way for Israel to peacefully attain its territorial goals – especially now, after its frequent, over-the-top demonstrations of American military might. But if it is allowed to do so by means of *violence*, this will create a horrible precedent, validate their means, and allow them to do anything they want, to *whoever* they want, afterward. This cannot be allowed to happen. If it is, Israel will become an enemy of all humanity (though I'd say it already qualifies as such).

On the other side of the ring, we have the Arabs.

These other Semite folks are poor, not very smart, and they not only kill others but themselves as well. They don't wage war; instead, they simply unleash their rage at random once in a while. They plan an isolated, half-assed attack, execute it poorly, and then have absolutely no idea of how to deal with the aftermath. They betray themselves and keep getting defeated time and again, by anyone they mess with. If they picked a fight with Guatemala, the Arabs would have to sue for peace two months later. The only thing they are actually good at is going out with a bang (I must give them this much at least).

Arabs have a very low average IQ, they can't see very far, and they don't know what the hell they are doing. The vast majority of them are Muslims, and all these seem to know is that they must kill every Jew because some ancient book of fables tells them to. And also because of what the Israelis have *actually* done to the Palestinians and others.

Have you ever read the *Al-Quran*? Read the first two or three pages of it. As not to spoil anything, I'll just say this: Islam "is a peaceful religion" my ass.

Anyone who takes that book seriously is demented (this is a conclusion based on those "first two or three pages," which are all I read of it) – a demented person who's bound to try to murder everyone else on the planet, since once they are done wiping the Jews off the face of the Earth the *Al-Quran* implies they should do the same to all other "infidels."

Thankfully (or "hopefully"), most Muslims do not take that book too seriously. Those who do become *Islamists* (Arab Zionists) and turn themselves into fireworks. Or they decapitate babies, rape women and execute men in front of their wives and children (by the way, the beheading of babies that supposedly occurred during the October 7th

attack was a lie forged by the IDF, with Netanyahu's own office later acknowledging they had no proof of such a thing happening. Hamas militants *did* burn some people alive on the occasion, though). Even if the Muslims do have valid reasons to justify their violent actions against the Israelis and these ones' enablers, such extraordinarily brutal acts go beyond any of them. Those among Muslims who commit that particular kind of inhumane atrocities are lost causes, and what they do to others is the fate they, themselves, deserve (the same goes for Israelis who act likewise).

But not all of them are like that. The vast majority probably isn't. There are millions of Muslims living peacefully in the US, the EU and other countries. Unlike Jews, they seem to mingle and blend in better with local populations. Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are American "allies," despite everything. The Palestinians, even if perhaps somewhat misrepresented by Hamas, are in fact struggling against a criminal, sadistic and oppressive occupier, fighting to recover lands they have the most legitimate claim to.

So who should we side with? Nazionist terrorists with a God complex, or Allahu-Akbar-BOOM! cavemen?

Neither - they are *both* horrific threats to all of us.

What we should do is to clean the American and British governments of Israeli agents, and other European countries' as well. We could start that by making any foreign-interest lobbying illegal in the US, which is something the American population itself would probably be more than okay with. Terrorist attacks practiced in the past against the US, the UK and others were direct consequences of such countries abetting Israel's endeavors against the Arabs, and to stop supporting it is the best way to guarantee the West's own population's safety.

Concomitantly, we should wane off the entire Western vehicle fleet from fossil fuels, rendering Israel, economically and geopolitically speaking, entirely irrelevant. Even the United States would likely stop caring about it once Israel stops making any money (by guaranteeing Middle Eastern oil is distributed according to American interests) for well-connected American billionaires.

Becoming irrelevant, Israel would lose most of its Western support. And without undeserved support, it wouldn't have an option but to dial down its imperialistic dreams and refrain from brutalizing people, otherwise it would run the risk of being actually

overwhelmed and defeated (the Israelis were apparently on the verge of running out of bombs and missiles when they first directly attacked Iran but, luckily for them, the latter didn't press the advantage).

Even if the Israelis' expansionist impetus and sadistic means were effectively curbed, the Arabs would probably still continue to create some problems (less, but still some) and to insist on developing their own nuclear arsenals. That's understandable, since every country *needs* nuclear warheads once *one* country on the planet has them. But Islamists, just like Zionists, can never be allowed to have any, because they are zealots (sadly, we've already failed at this when the United States helped Israel to manufacture its own atomic bombs). They both follow the whimsical rules of imagination, not the logical ones of the universe. They cannot be predicted or expected to act reasonably, so they cannot have the means to annihilate our entire species at their disposal. But I'd expect the Arabs - even Islamists - to settle down once Israel stops provoking them. If not, we'd have to go to war against them. But our chances of winning would be 100% anyway, which drastically mitigates the issue. Meanwhile, defeating Israel alone while it is deeply infiltrated in foreign governments, fully backed by immoral superpowers and packing its own nukes is a much harder endeavor.

Thus, the world's goal, as it pertains to the Middle East, should be to weaken and pacify - or preferably entirely destroy - Israel *first*. And then the Arabs, *if* still necessary.

Just to wrap this whole thing up: I read a while back that the Palestinians *really* believe they are going to win the war (perhaps not the current one, but "the long one"). Why?

"Because God wills it."

And the punchline is that I'm not joking - multiple people were interviewed and literally answered that.

Though Zionists technically believe the same thing, one of them once managed to convince the others that creating an army, arming themselves to the teeth and taking what they want by force and manipulation did not violate what is prescribed in the Torah. That man argued that Jews are the instruments of God so, to enact His will, they can/should/must make it happen by their own hands. That's

how the Zionists circumvented their own beliefs, enabling themselves to do whatever they please (*them* – not their God).

Zionists “forget” that they did live in the Land of Israel three thousand years ago and were then expelled out of it which, given that God is infallible, means He actually willed for the Jews to *lose* those lands, and not to keep them. If God ever promised those lands to the Jewish people, He clearly changed His mind a long time ago. And even if that weren’t the case, what God supposedly promised them is a fairly small, arid backwater piece of land, which means that even in the Zionists’ idealized fantasy He never liked them very much (since nearly everyone else on the planet got something better).

When zealots decide they are free to change their deity’s will to always coincide perfectly with their own, regardless of their sacred texts, their religious tenets or anything else, what we get is a criminal organization dedicated to [ultimately] dominating the entire planet, one that believes it not only can but in fact *should* forcefully take whatever it wants from others. People who [wrongly] believe they are special and everyone else is beneath them give birth to institutions such as the Holy Inquisition, the Soviet Union, the National Socialist German Worker’s party, Israel and the United States of America. (Some people *are* better than others and they *should* rule the planet, but this is not a simple matter of race or place of birth. Not currently, at least.)

While the Israel-Hamas war lasted, the way the IDF conducted itself against the entirety of the Palestinian people was a daily, unnerving reminder of our species’ absolute failure, of our global lack of morals, empathy and sense of justice. While such levels of indiscriminate cruelty are allowed to go on in our planet, to remain unpunished, be repeated and rewarded, we are *all* worthless.

The Asian Standard

I have personally met only a few Asians, all of them Japanese descendants, none native. But I have to say something about them, because they form up about 25% of the human race (counting only those with epicanthic folds; disregarding Indians).

Two of those Asians I met at school, they mostly kept to themselves, and that's fine. The third one is an "internet friend" of mine who's smarter than most people but also completely unreliable. And lastly, there was this 40-year-old or so Japanese dude who once assaulted me from behind, after an escalating tit-for-tat that he started but in which I wasn't entirely innocent. It didn't end well for him.

So, judging by my own experience, I'd say the Japanese aren't particularly polite. Maybe the ones who live in Japan are, but those who migrated elsewhere seem to be mostly like everyone else (culture over genes, once again), except weirder.

The Japanese are not particularly smart either, despite what most people seem to think. What happens is they *study* a lot, because they are encouraged and forced to by their parents. And smart people are always those who study the least, because they don't *need* to.

Chinese people, on the other hand, I've never personally met any. But I've noticed some interesting things about them nonetheless.

First, just to share a funny story: I once tried to find some OEM manufacturers in China because I was considering opening a retail website of my own and importing some items from there. After I posted a request on a certain Chinese website, one guy replied to it. He offered to sell me computer keyboards for US\$4 apiece. Since the keyboards had nothing to do with what I was looking and asked for, I politely declined his offer. Then he replied to my refusal, saying, "OK! OK! I see you smart guy! US\$1.50 the keyboard!" (quite literally that).

Apparently, it's part of the Chinese culture to haggle and, if you don't, they rip you off *hard*. I had heard that somewhere before, and that episode confirmed its veracity.

The Chinese always *cheat* in any and every game as well. As someone who plays a lot of computer ones, I don't remember seeing a single high-score-based game in which the first ranking player wasn't a Chinese name with a mathematically unachievable score. In multiplayer ones, they use all sorts of hacks, always ruining everyone else's experience.

Combined, those two things - always trying to rip people off and cheating on everything they can - lead to the conclusion that the Chinese are *endemically dishonest*.

As a second point, the Chinese also seem to favor quantity over quality. They do a lot of stuff, but all of it is poorly done. That's notorious, since we are all familiar with made-in-China products. But that mentality seems to have evolved from simple laziness and lack of care to an actual *mindset*. It seems to be an integral part of how the Chinese think and act, affecting everything they do.

The fact that the Chinese are both sloppy and endemically dishonest leads me to the conclusion that, if they didn't live under an authoritarian/totalitarian regime, they wouldn't be able to progress. They'd keep learning and working as little as possible, lying all the time, ripping each other off, voting poorly and electing swindlers. And an economy, and by extension a society, can't evolve or thrive on those grounds.

My point is: the Chinese probably *need* a firmer hand on the tiller to manage to get anything done. They may need to be somewhat oppressed, to be more roughly treated by their own government, and to have less freedom to act with at least some decency and work with a minimal amount of diligence. They must be somewhat violently forced to behave civically and lashed into working, or they won't do either. With too much lenience, they would likely become stagnated or ultimately destroy themselves. And if they were allowed to democratically select their leaders, China would probably become the most corrupt and dysfunctional country on the planet.

Another interesting thing about China is that, despite the high levels of censorship and monitoring their people are subjected to, there are some topics they can discuss freely that we, in the West, can't. Certain social issues, some events of their history and other "politically sensitive" subjects are heavily censored in China, but while we tend to believe the Chinese can't say a thing about the CCP or its members, criticism of the government is actually amply tolerated there. What isn't, at all, is *mobilization* against it¹¹ (labor unions, for instance, which are a scourge wherever they exist, are illegal in China).

China and the West have the same goal and use similar means to achieve it: the two of them seek a better life for their citizens, and they both use varying degrees of censorship and oppression to try to achieve that end. But China follows a different path than us, based on its own history and on the particular culture and mentality of its people. The Chinese people are smarter than Western ones, in some

¹¹ **Source:** https://gking.harvard.edu/files/gking/files/censored.pdf?mod=article_inline (Accessed in August, 2025).

aspects their quality of life is better than ours, and their country will, very soon, lead the global economy (surpassing the US's and the EU's GDP, individually considered) and spearhead human technology. By being a one-party communist state, China's government can do what must be done instead of being forced to do what misinformed people think should be (as opposite to what happens in a democracy). By defending collectivism and Confucian principles, it can mobilize and coordinate its entire, vast population to fulfill a single goal, and to do so as soon as the need arises.

The Chinese ways are different from ours and we frown heavily upon them. But the things we criticize them the most for are exactly what makes China a stronger country than any Western one. And by now, after the CCP's plan finally started bearing fruits, their people live considerably better than we are led to believe by the exponents of capitalism and democracy.

If you still have time and enough encephalic mass left, this may be a great time to start learning Mandarin. (Thirty years from now it might be mandatory.)

Going Global

Just a short, final note while I'm still on the subject of ethnic bias:

By my own experience, in general: Americans are arrogant; Europeans are rude; Australians are neutral; and Canadians are by far the nicest people.

That's what I concluded from the somewhat limited, direct interactions I've had with people from those nationalities. But the interesting thing is that, when I told those impressions of mine to a friend – a PhD psychiatrist who has travelled pretty much all over the world – she immediately agreed with me.

What's important to note about this unending ethnic war we find ourselves in is that there are patterns, and we are entitled to notice and take them into account. We are flawed, facts are facts, we all share a horrible history, someone is always to blame, we insist on repeating the same mistakes, we haven't truly evolved as a species, and we are not only entitled to, but in fact *must* acknowledge and act upon all of this.

It's not about being against these or those people, against groups determined by language, ethnicity or place of origin. It's about recognizing what is wrong with each and any of us and dealing with it. And what is wrong is the human being itself – *all* of us, in nearly every possible way.

We Don't Have a Problem

We *are* the problem. I think I've made that abundantly clear by now, but there's more.

The most important war fought in history – the one that decided who would own the entire planet and determine the fate of every being that lives on it – was fought a long time ago. We have no historical records of it, but we do know the outcome. As expected, the most unscrupulous beings won: us.

We are violent animals programmed to live in a tribal environment, and a life form that naturally favors selfishness. We have exterminated up to ten thousand different animal species in the past 500 years (there's no consensus on the exact number) and dwindled the global wildlife population by 73% in the past 50 years alone. And that's not to mention other *human* species. Only the Aboriginal Australians, who I don't believe qualify as *Homo sapiens sapiens* (yes, there are two “sapiens” in it) and possibly a few other indigenous people that don't qualify either have “managed” to survive us (simply because we didn't bother to genocide them too).

I heard somewhere that there's evidence that the sapiens often *mated* with Neanderthals, *Homo floresiensis*, etc., and I assume this conclusion comes exclusively from the fact that many of us carry some of those “extinct” genes in ourselves. To me, it seems a lot more likely that we killed all their men and *raped* their women, as this is far more typical of the Sapiens' *modus operandi*. You and I, we are the grandchildren of those rapes.

Whether we like it or not, we must deal with the fact that we are savages. In an ample sense, we are still a very primitive, organic species – the most basic type of lifeform there is. We killed everything in our path, are causing severe damage to our planet, and

not for the first time we teeter on the edge of exterminating ourselves.

Here's a fun way to look at things: how would Earth feel about humans?

Regardless of whether a planet can feel or not, ours do seem to be reacting somewhat like our own bodies do when we have an *infection*, raising its temperature to see if this kills us. We've literally made the world feverish.

To quote Root, a character from the series *Person of Interest*: "We are bad code." We are programmed "wrong." The human behavioral code served practical purposes in the distant past, but it no longer does so. We are no longer fighting for survival, but to *improve* our lives. The only thing left in this planet that we yet have to struggle to overcome is ourselves and the problems we create on our own. It's ironic: once the purpose of that which was necessary for our species to survive was fulfilled, some of the very things that kept us alive automatically became our nemeses. Whereas in the past we were sometimes forced to kill too many animals and even other people to eat the first ones' meat or steal the second's belongings, just to stay alive, nowadays doing so is no longer required. Now, still having that mentality and continuing to behave as we always did is exactly what causes most of the issues we constantly have to deal with.

Having managed to survive our environment, the path forward now requires us to cooperate with each other. We must figure out a way to overcome our innermost impulses, or we'll be unable to progress much further. See what has been accomplished in Norway, Germany or the United States, where a large number of people have [kind of] managed to work together (in exchange for money) for a few centuries now. Then look at what has been accomplished in Africa or the Middle East, where they never did.

Nature's role was to evolve us until we were capable *to progress on our own*. It has fulfilled its part millions of years ago by gifting us with [some] intelligence. And we have barely started doing ours yet - despite everything we have supposedly learned, we still behave fundamentally like ignorant animals.

We can think, act and change both our environment and ourselves. Collectively, we have the required numbers, knowledge and technology. But individually, we refuse to make things better, because we are programmed to be neurochemically rewarded much

more for being apes than men. Between the tough right or the easy wrong, between long-lasting benefits or quickly getting doped, between everyone else or our lone selves, we always go with the second option.

We have managed to keep eight billion people fed at once, to cure the majority of known diseases, to provide enormous cities with sewage systems and potable water, to craft anatomic furniture that makes us more comfortable, to create games that can keep us almost constantly entertained and devices that allow us to communicate and share knowledge much faster than we ever could before, at any [worldly] distance. But technology alone won't do the trick, because making bigger guns only makes it easier for us to kill each other. By rocketing into space we'll achieve nothing other than to soil the sky with our crap (as we have already done with Earth's orbit). And it doesn't matter how many pixels we have in our screens or how many colonies we establish on other planets, because if we don't understand our own purpose and try to make things better by assigning proper goals to ourselves and attempting to realize them, all of our "successes" will serve only to keep ourselves *suffering for longer*.

To be fair, while we fought against the environment, seeking our species' survival, we advanced in many other areas other than just raw technology. Our societal structures changed, as did some of our moral values and the laws that supposedly ensue from them. But even though I just used the word "advanced," many such steps weren't necessarily taken *forward*. Considering everything our species has achieved, do you think that with your well-paid job, fancy clothes, expensive car, golden watch and state-of-the-art computer, living in a large, noisy and polluted city riddled with crime and traffic, and having to don a ridiculous suit every day in the morning, you are *happier* than an Indian who sleeps in a tent and hunts with a makeshift wooden bow is? Do you think your life is better than his? Less stressful? More comfortable? Do you think you feel safer than the members of isolated tribes do living in the middle of nowhere with no contact with the rest of mankind? Do you think they are insulted and/or attacked more often than you are? Do you think you are healthier than them? Do you think they'd envy you?

Once upon a time, we had to hunt once every three or four days, for just a few hours, to gather food, and we were then left with the rest of the time for R&R. Now we have to "hunt" eight hours a day, five days a week, can't relax during weekends because we are stressed,

and we get a single month a year to try to actually live. We used to work in our underwear, now we have to literally tie a noose around our own necks every morning before even starting. If we wanted to do something elsewhere, we could once walk, ride a horse or paddle a canoe there. Now we have to be stuck in traffic for hours, elbow our way inside crowded subway trains and buses, or board an airplane and fly thousands of kilometers away to do something we don't want to. In ages past, we looked up at the night sky and saw the milky way. Now the heavens seem to have abandoned us, for barely half a dozen stars stare back when we gaze at them from beneath an ever-thickening cloud of dirt. We could sleep in complete darkness and absolute silence, whereas now our cities are lit up all night long, with vehicles and neighbors noising around from dusk till dawn. We used to spend our entire lives sober, and now we need a constant stream of drinks and drugs just to refrain from killing ourselves.

But we *did* manage to survive!

Yes, we did. Now, we live twice or thrice longer than what people used to up until a few centuries ago. And we get to spend two to three times longer doing something we hate ten times more than people hated what they did in the olden days.

Not only did our lives actually get worse, but *we* got worse too. Trying to accumulate enough money to perhaps find an isolated spot where we may be able to live like we used to in ages past, in a clean environment (if any remains) and as far away as possible from other people, we have become greedier. To stand any chance of amassing the wealth required to do that, we have become more selfish. Striving for that has rendered us anxious and teeming with stress. And the few who eventually succeed at never having to study or work against their will again automatically become arrogant, because they know everyone tries and yet virtually no one ever manages to get there.

We now pride ourselves of being the worst we can possibly be, because this *is* how one succeeds in the world *we* have created.

We've come up with governing systems that don't work. We've birthed billions of lives that should never have been born, saved millions of others that shouldn't have been saved, and killed millions that shouldn't have died. We've turned massive amounts of natural resources into trash heaps and then threw much of it into the sea,

poisoning and suffocating billions of animals that never harmed or threatened us in any way.

We've made the world a worse place for every species that inhabits it and, still, we didn't get any better for it.

After having completely overcome our environment, we now ought to focus our attention on improving ourselves. If we just keep following the technological path we've followed throughout history, it won't end well. We already have all the technology we really *need*, and progressing further in this direction, at this point, will only create more advanced menaces such as bigger bombs, faster quantum computers, smarter artificial intelligences and stronger robots which, in current-state human hands, are all bound to cause serious and potentially irreversible damage.

We will continue to be miserable animals and to make every other species around us miserable as well until we embrace "*deliberate* (or 'artificial') *evolution*" and start working towards fixing both our innate and man-made flaws. The good news is that there are several means available for us to do that: we can mind our own manners better; we can provide a proper education for everyone; we can try to assimilate some of what I have previously said, understanding the purpose of our existence and trying to fulfill it. We can work towards unifying the human race, so that a minimally acceptable level of mutual understanding, respect, stability and peace can be achieved. We can improve our laws and governing systems, our media vehicles and our communication skills. We can allow only decent people to reproduce, and we could even directly alter the human genome if we simply decided to make such a practice legal.

We have to start working on all of that, or things are likely to start getting [even] worse, and not better, from now on. But we won't refocus our efforts, because technology – especially when destructive – *pays*, and this is all that matters to modern, greedy human beings.

A Failed Experiment

As I briefly mentioned in the last topic, life's initial goal is to evolve to the point where it can start improving itself – natural evolution's purpose is to create *intelligent beings*. On Earth, it succeeded once

our long-dead ancestors were born. Since then, evolving life further has been entirely up to us, and we haven't achieved much in this sense. We have failed in doing what is right more often than we do what is wrong; we haven't managed to implement justice; we are still selfish, greedy, uncivilized, emotional and far stupider than we *could* be. We are probably worse people today than we ever were before.

Perhaps all the mistakes we've made and continue to are inevitable. It could be that all primitive lifeforms going through the same stages of evolution we are currently experiencing fall into the same pitfalls we keep falling into, ruining their own existence just like we insist on ruining ours. But I find this highly unlikely, as there are far too many possibilities for a single path to be available to all species that have developed basic levels of intelligence.

Since our universe is deterministic, humanity's fate is what it is – it was inevitable that *we* would end up like this. But if we imagine a hypothetical "Earth 2," one that is identical to ours except for some minor details, it's not hard to see how things could have turned out better. If, for instance, the Romans had a better understanding of the economy, and consequently didn't keep minting ever cheaper coins to pay for their military's and bureaucracy's costs, it may be that by now, in "Earth 2," the whole planet would already be united under the Roman Empire's flag. After many thousands of years of intelligent existence, it seems perfectly possible that we could have already managed to unify our culture, our language and our economy, having a much more stable society in which wars, systemic torture, violent suppression of dissenting opinions, etc. were a thing of the distant past.

A man once decided to steal his neighbor's food instead of growing his own crops and, had he chosen otherwise, we might all have been better off today. Two armies once faced each other and, had the outcome of that battle been different, we might all have been better off today. A driver once missed his exit on a highway and, had he been paying attention, we might all have been better off today. There are infinite "what ifs" that didn't happen to us but *could* and *might* have happened to other similar species. And any of those "what ifs," had they come to pass, would have changed the course of humanity, with a semi-infinite number of them leading to a better outcome than our actual destiny led to, just like semi-infinite others would have led to an even worse one.

Everything is a roll of a dice. Ours was rolled for us, and it seems to me that we were unlucky.

There's a chance we have already messed things up *too hard*. It's possible that humanity is already set on a path that leads to stagnation. It may sound like "stagnation" is not a particularly bad thing, but it can be depending on what point we get hopelessly stuck at. As an example we have the African continent, where people have inhabited the same place, reproduced among themselves, created their own culture and habits, and perpetuated these for far longer than anyone else on Earth, and yet they never managed to get past the tribal level of evolution. To this day, they still haven't managed to feed themselves, constantly requiring aid from all over the world to survive. On their own, they never managed to infer the existence of an entire universe beyond Earth, to develop effective surgical procedures, discover the combustion engine, produce electric energy, create electronic devices, or escape our planet's gravity. Africans existed for longer than any other group of human beings, but their way of doing things doesn't work and led them to become stagnated. For a long time now they haven't had a future, because they set themselves on a wrong path, failing to evolve.

Some of the Arabs, as another example, were once considerably more advanced than the Europeans. The Babylonians (whose descendants are now mostly found in Iraq and Syria) invented the written language, developed their medicinal knowledge scientifically, wrote the Code of Hammurabi, built Ziggurats and irrigation systems. Meanwhile, the collective Europe was essentially formed by illiterate barbarians who based their whole healing craft in humors and bleeding. But then it seems some madman convinced the Babylonians, Akkadians, Arameans and others that he had spoken directly with God, who told him they were doing everything wrong. That turned those now known as Arabs into religious zealots who wear dresses, sit on the floor and stone women to death for no reason. They created and then believed in lies, veered into the wrong path, and have been trapped in a nightmarish past ever since.

Nothing dictates our species as a *whole* can't become stagnated as well. Given how far we still are from achieving what we should aim for, how we still confuse "right" and "wrong," and how we continue to ruin our own existence after hundreds of thousands, or even millions of years of sufficient awareness, it's possible we may be just another *failed species* out of trillions of others like ours that must

exist out there. And we must be aware of what our [potential] failure means. We must remind ourselves of what rides on our shoulders.

Imagine an 18-year-old kid suffocating under a cloud of mustard gas, starving inside a damp trench in the frontlines of World War I right before a flamethrower burns him alive. Imagine a warrior on a medieval battlefield, being trampled and mangled by a cavalry charge, dying with his broken face stuck in the mud while others fight on top of his back. Imagine an old man with Alzheimer's, waking up not knowing where he is, staring at a woman he doesn't recognize as his wife. Imagine the whole life of a girl who was born blind, or that of a boy born without arms. Imagine the agony and painful death of the millions once afflicted with the black plague. Imagine a fly being digested alive inside a spider's stomach, and the same happening to a calf paralyzed inside a snake's. Imagine a woman in labor trying to give natural birth to a mispositioned fetus. Imagine another one being beaten and raped by a dozen different men at once. Imagine an Arab who has been a prisoner in Guantanamo Bay for eight years, and his family's despair at not knowing what happened to him. Imagine a couple of parents watching their toddler jumping out of the 12th floor window. Imagine a man tending to his crops and stepping on a forgotten mine, bathed on the blood of his own vaporized legs. Imagine a hunter being mauled by a bear, another one being eaten alive by a lion, and a surfer being dragged deep underwater by a shark. Imagine each time someone had a headache, a fever or a nightmare. Imagine the sheer terror of all those who came before us when they realized they were minutes or seconds away from dying.

I mean it: close your eyes, focus, and imagine all of that happening to *you*. Try to feel an inkling of such pain and desperation.

Imagine an unimaginable number of such occurrences.

Add them all up.

Now imagine it was *all in vain*.

That will be the case if we fail.

If we do not improve, if we continue to refuse to follow the path of reason, all the unbearable suffering all living beings ever had to endure on Earth will have been *wasted*. That unfathomable agony will have been endured for nothing, and others will have to go

through all of it *again*, elsewhere, so that someone else can fulfill life's purpose in our stead.

If we fail as a species, it may be the worst kind of failure our universe can admit – this may literally be the worst case scenario, the most horrible thing possible. And since we are able to *justify* all the suffering every living being ever had to endure on Earth, if we fail to do so we are the worst shit in the universe.

The Final Solution

(I'm aware of what the title above implies, but I couldn't think of a better combination of words to accurately represent what I'm about to say.)

Homogeneity. This is what we need – not diversity, but the very opposite of it. And for me to explain why, you must first understand something else that may initially seem completely unrelated: that we, humans, do not possess *true creativity*.

Anything our brains can come up with is nothing but a rearrangement of the information we have previously acquired. To imagine a geometrical shape with three hundred and twelve vertices for the first time is not to create something *new*, but simply to take the ideas of “geometrical shape,” “vertices,” “lines” and “two or three dimensions” and add them together.

We learn what we can about reality using our senses, and then all we can do is to combine and/or extrapolate what we have learned this way using our minds. A bigger pyramid is nothing original compared to a previous, smaller one. Neither of them is really new to anyone familiar with triangles and squares, even if the person has never seen an actual pyramid before. A newly written book doesn't tell a truly original story, instead just rearranging old, well-known words to define characters in terms of human characteristics that the author is familiar with and events that in one way or another relate to real past ones, so that a tale can be told which might *seem* innovative even though it seeks to trigger the same common reactions the things it is based upon have always triggered in the human brain.

To make things simple, try this: imagine a color you have never seen.

Give it a go.

Keep going.

Let me know when you have given up.

There are about three trillion times more photon wavelengths than those our eyes can interpret and our brains convert into colors (I got that number somewhere, but other sources claim there are *infinite* possible photon wavelengths), and yet we cannot imagine how a single one of them could look like.

We lack freedom of imagination. The best our brains can do is to rearrange the “building blocks” acquired from the external world by our senses and combine them in a way that maybe no one did before. That’s what we call “a new idea,” and this is as far as human creativity goes.

This limitation of ours matters because how any person other than ourselves sees the world is intrinsically different from how we, personally, do so. Each one of us reacts somewhat differently to the same stimuli, behaves a little differently under the same circumstances, and may come up with different solutions to the same problem. We differ from each other not only because we’ve had distinct past experiences, but in good part because the very workings of our individual brains are unique. And we also have no means to directly compare two human minds, no means to make one of them temporarily experience the reality of another. We have no means to access that which not only guides but in fact *defines* how people other than ourselves feel, think and act.

Since the sensory information each one of us receives and the way our brains interpret it differ; we can’t experience how other people assess reality, being completely unfamiliar with their unique view of the world; and we can’t even imagine how they experience it either because, lacking the fundamental knowledge required to do so (being unable to mentally “create” what another mind could be like due to lacking the basic “shapes” and “lines” required to do so), *we can never truly understand another human being* – doing so is literally impossible.

We can imagine how it is for someone to have more or less memory than we do, or how a color blind person sees (literally) the world, because we are familiar with the concepts of “memory” and “color” –

all we have to do is to extrapolate them. But we cannot fathom what it is like to be, for example, smarter or stupider than we are. We can understand the practical consequences of one thing or the other, but we cannot imagine how our own mind would work if it were fundamentally different, because ours is the sole reference we have. We can't truly understand how other people experience *pain* either, because the definition of the word is simply "an unpleasant sensation," which potentially encompasses infinite possibilities and degrees of intensity. We even have masochists around, who enjoy it instead (by the way, women enjoy it too, because for them pain and sexual pleasure are processed in the same area of the brain). And being unaware of how others feel and deal with pain we have trouble determining when and how to harm or avoid harming others, deciding when someone actually needs our help, choosing how to punish those who deserve it, etc.

In general, we are largely similar. For example, an orange, to me, may have *almost* the same taste it has to you, just slightly sweeter or sourer. I probably have a little more or less sweet- or sour-tasting buds in my tongue than you do, they could each be more or less sensitive than yours, the region of my brain responsible for interpreting taste may have more or less neurons than yours, and how these connect to each other certainly differs between your brain and mine. But some people seem to be completely different: one's strawberry may taste like another's avocado. Some of us love seafood, red meat, or eggs, while others can't stand any of them. And such opposite reactions to the same things can only be explained in two ways: either a food tastes differently for different people, or the same taste is considered good by some and bad by others. Either way, how we interpret the same stimulus varies – everything has a *different value* for each one of us.

The divergences that exist between our tastes also exist between our sights, our hearings, our senses of smell and touch. Our nervous systems are not distributed identically throughout our bodies and the very signals they use must vary in frequency and intensity, if not in how they are coded as well. If those signals differ, how our brains handle them also has to. And if how our brains deal with information varies, then *how* we think – in the rawest possible sense – must too.

Some people assimilate information better if they hear it; others, if they read it. Some have eidetic memories; others can't remember one-item shopping lists. Some can vividly see pictures in their minds while awake; others can't even dream while asleep. Some can plan

and wait; others always seek immediate rewards. Some can quickly do complex calculations mentally; others have a hard time using a calculator. Some think faster than they speak; others speak slowly because they can't think fast enough. Some can multi-task; others must focus. Some are blind to reason; others can see nothing but it. Some believe everything is going to be okay; others know it won't.

The gist of what I'm trying to say lies in the very way our thoughts work and materialize, on things that we have no words for and I no means to directly reference. It lies on something each one of us knows only one of and will *never* know another (not in this life, at least). It may be that what I call "a thought" has nothing to do with what you call the same. In a way, my "thoughts" could be like "colors" while yours may be like "sounds." Meanwhile you are blind, I'm deaf, and yet we must find a way to communicate and reach a long series of agreements based upon what is logical, as this is the only common ground we all share.

On top of the differences between how we think and feel, each one of us has also lived a different life. So, every human being also handles a particular set of "common data" (concrete facts that we can all understand) when reaching their own conclusions, forming their personal opinions and making decisions.

Adding everything up, what we have is eight billion people who view and feel the world differently, who have had their own particular experiences and who each handle the information they receive using a unique mental process. We are eight billion people living in wildly different realities who can't imagine, and thus can never hope to understand, each other's - even *if* we bothered trying. And we are all trapped together on the same planet, sharing the same space, wanting the same things and fighting over the same resources.

Hence why I defend *homogeneity*: because we must close the gap between our individual realities if we are to reach any kind of widespread and enduring consensus. And we need to reach one (or rather many) to, one day, live in a future that can be deemed desirable, one in which disgrace and agony have been eradicated and human life is finally worth living.

Even if we try to do right by others, it often doesn't work because we instinctively start from the false premise that everyone else feels and thinks like us, that they seek and avoid the same things we do. But as our personal realities differ, so do our individual objectives. If these vary, so must our choices, actions, and behavior (the means we adopt

to achieve our goals). If we behave differently from others, our attitude and conduct will disagree with and collide against theirs. And what that means is that *from diverging minds, conflict inevitably ensues*.

What is obvious to one person can be unfathomable to another. A heartfelt compliment can be interpreted as a bold-faced insult. A compassionate stroke can be taken as a slap to the face. A loving kiss can be perceived as sexual harassment. A life-saving shove can be seen as attempted homicide. Killing an innocent person can be considered laudable. What is right can be seen as wrong, and what is wrong can be seen as right. In practice, it all depends exclusively on *whom* you ask.

Since we have no means to truly know what guides any other human being, the best we can do is to *guess* what will or won't set someone else off. As a rule, we do that based on what would irk *us*, which often fails to yield the expected result due to the factors I've been mentioning. For our interactions with other people to work, we need to observe, take risks and, by trial and error, eventually learn what another person likes or dislikes, how they feel about all kinds of different things, what they intend to achieve and what means they are willing to adopt to fulfill their personal goals. To understand (partially, at best) a single person that way takes a long time and inevitably incurs in plenty of accidents along the way, of which many could permanently interrupt the familiarization process, souring or definitively ending the relationship.

We may care about those closest to us, about our families, friends and co-workers – those we know we'll *have to deal with* frequently and/or for a long time. About all others, who we don't directly interact with or hardly ever do so, we don't give a damn. (If you feel an impulse to refute that, count how many tears you just shed for the twenty seven people or so who died around the world while you were reading this paragraph.)

Since guessing how other people interpret reality is impracticable, our only option to achieve a proper level of mutual understanding is *for all of us to become both genetically and culturally alike* because, together, these things determine how our brains work, how we think and feel, what we believe in, what we aim for and, ultimately, whether we achieve our objectives or fail to. They determine who we are and how we conduct ourselves in both our individual and collective endeavors.

To be culturally and genetically similar means to have only *one* race (or species) of human beings inhabiting Earth. This is the closest we can get to being of one mind, to being able to agree more than to disagree with one another.

Without mutual understanding, agreement and cooperation, there's conflict, there's war. This "diversity war" we were forced into and by ourselves have only made worse will either go on forever or until all those who are different (from the winning party) have been exterminated. Without a winner, we remain on the path of eternal suffering.

Progress is hindered without homogeneity, and peace can't last without it.

I can only think of two arguments in favor of the so widely-defended *diversity*:

One is that different minds reach different conclusions, "creating" different things. If we were all alike, in theory so would be our ideas, our songs, our paintings, our buildings, our stories and everything else we made. Differences in ourselves can lead to different "creations," making life as a whole more interesting. And the second argument is that diversity may better prepare our species for a wider range of random threats, thanks to more diverse genes. But both those arguments are moot, because diversity leads *directly* to suffering, nullifying life's purpose.

Having a slightly more interesting life with murder, war, torture, rape, theft, kidnapping, fighting, constant fear and a lot of pain for everyone is *not* better than having a slightly less interesting but peaceful one – not by a million miles. And "being similar" is also not the same as "being *equal*." If our species becomes homogenized, each person will still have their own unique brain, live their own life, have their own singular experiences and knowledge. Thus, being homogenized we would still be able to have a plethora of different ideas, reach *slightly* different conclusions (because, collectively, we are expected to become much more reasonable [meaning we would agree much more often on *the* correct solution to any problem]) and "create" new things.

At the same time, regarding the second argument in favor of diversity, nothing dictates we can't become homogeneous *and* keep all that's best in us. It should be possible to rid ourselves *only* of our

undesirable attributes, becoming a stronger race in all aspects than any current one. And since we are the greatest threat to ourselves, being homogeneous would also automatically make us all *safer* than being diversified, as simply being able to understand each other ought to lead to an increase in mutual respect and empathy, to us working together rather than against each other, and to us focusing on what's best for everyone. This, in turn, would make any threat or menace that came our way much *easier* to handle – and not harder – whatever its source and nature. Thus, I see no upside whatsoever to diversity.

“But hey! Look! Those people over there paint their faces poorly and dance to an off-compass drumbeat while wearing ridiculous clothes, all because they think that will make it rain! They must be preserved!” Yeah... no, there's no need. Really: *none*.

Many of humanity's major issues derive from disagreements, from incompatible realities and perspectives, and diversity is the very source of the problem, not the remedy for it. By using it as the latter we have been attempting to treat the symptoms – and not the *cause* of this disease – by forcing people to temporarily coexist somewhat peacefully. But underneath, the sickness keeps spreading. Differences keep increasing, hate keeps growing, and so does the number of people treading this Earth. The objectives we should be pursuing, and by being this diversified *can't*, remain unchanged, while the livable area and amount of non-renewable resources in our planet keep diminishing. Time keeps passing as we keep failing, and we will eventually run out of it.

By the way things are going, we will come to a point where we have too many people on Earth and no conditions to sustain them all. Many will lack electronics, utensils, furniture, a place to live in, food, water, air. People will become desperate and be forced to choose between saving themselves (those who are similar to them) or others (those who aren't). No one will agree on a solution, everyone will favor their own kind, and we are all going to side with those who are like us to kill everyone who isn't.

Diversity leads to war – a war in which everyone loses.

While being as diversified as we currently are, a day may also come, and rather soon, when we cannot develop more advanced technologies, which is pretty much the only thing we've managed to

do, so far, as a species. And this would bring us to a *complete* evolutionary halt.

Diversity *discourages* those among us who are able to discover and invent from doing so because, in a globalized world, whenever anyone creates something new it ends falling into the hands of those who are unlike them, in the hands of people who, by having different moral values, behaviors and goals are in fact the first one's *enemies*.

Once you develop something new, everyone else will learn it exists. They will know it *can* be done. Aware of this, they'll immediately start trying to replicate your findings, they'll eventually succeed, and they'll finally have what you originally discovered or created. And then they'll be able to use it *against you*. The atomic bomb is a concrete example of this, AI is another, and even direr inventions must await us in the future.

If you are the first person to develop nuclear weapons, you'll consider its implications. The people who found themselves in that position did so. You may still go ahead by thinking, "People [*like me*] would never be irresponsible enough to use this without a good reason." But then you'll remember that not everyone is like you, and your very next thought will be, "I cannot create this, because others will eventually use it to kill my people, my friends, my family and me."

We went ahead with the atomic bomb and are now hurrying ahead with AIs because of what I have previously said when I talked about "evil always winning:" we greenlight such creations because we must *assume* that, if we don't, others will. And once they have done so, we must also assume they will be willing to use those weapons against us. But would we have to fear such outcome, to police ourselves in such a way and to act upon such assumptions if we were a homogeneous species? If we all shared the same values and could actually understand each other? Would we have to hold ourselves back, to irresponsibly rush our endeavors or to develop the most dangerous devices we can possibly imagine if we had no one to use them on except *ourselves*?

Probably not.

Despite the "probably," being of one kind is our best shot.

“Diversity,” sociologically speaking, essentially means “different people.” If people are different and *some* of them are good, this means all others are bad. Ergo, whenever you have diversity you have *bad* people around. Whenever someone defends diversity itself, they are protecting, and thus perpetuating, the existence of people who shouldn’t exist.

There’s a tipping point where bad people outnumber good ones by a large enough margin to halt all progress – a point where things are eaten faster than they are grown, forgotten faster than they are learned, stolen faster than they are purchased, destroyed faster than they are built. We naturally drift towards that point because the worst among us reproduce faster than everyone else. And reaching it means to cross a red line: whoever does so becomes stagnated, and homogeneity can no longer help them because there’s no point in homogenizing a population, or a whole species, of *undesirable* people.

That line can be crossed in different ways. Countries like Venezuela and Bolivia have done so via socialism, and Brazil follows the same path. Iran, Syria and others have crossed it via Islam. The United States might do the same in the not-so-distant future via greed, or it may do so, along with many European countries, via DEI policies.

Luckily, there are many countries on this planet, and China in particular (if not “exclusively”) seems to be moving *away* from the line. If nonetheless a day comes when all of humanity crosses it, thanks to our current technology that day will probably mark the beginning of the end of our existence.

On a more constructive note, to *achieve homogeneity* we have three options:

- 1 – To pick a single group of people and exterminate all others;
- 2 – To mix everyone up and end with a sad average of ourselves;
- 3 – Or to allow only select individuals, from any and all groups, to mate and reproduce.

Alternative 1 gives us a choice, it is simple, yields acceptable results, and faces insurmountable opposition, even though to “exterminate all others” there’s no need to kill or harm anyone in any way: all

that's necessary is to *stop the reproduction* of those we must rid ourselves of.

Alternative 2 doesn't give us a choice, no one really knows the outcome, it won't be better than alternative 1's because many inappropriate genes and cultures will survive, it takes thousands of years, and it's considered "politically correct" even though it *does* lead to unnecessary pain, to a lot of killing, torturing, warring, etc.

Given a choice, would you like to be a brownish person, with brown eyes, curly hair and epicanthic folds; to have a 6% chance of having been born with a serious genetic disease; to be 1.68 meters tall and have an IQ of 82; and to speak Chinese and make US\$1,480 a month? This is a fairly reasonable description of what an *average* human being would be like.

Between 60% and 70% of the world's population would answer "yes" to the money (because they currently make less than that), 1.3 billion people wouldn't mind speaking Chinese at all, and probably no one would want the rest (except perhaps the epicanthic folds).

The average human is trash, as is his life, which is why calling someone "mediocre" is not considered a compliment anywhere on Earth.

Alternative 3 is the best, in my opinion. Despite the importance of genetics, culture seems to be the most prominent factor in determining behavior, in guiding our actions and shaping our collective reality. And a proper culture can be taught to any person, of any race, so long as they are *raised* in it.

Since there are good and bad people (including in the genetic sense) of every ethnicity, to decide who should live and multiply and who should cease to exist based on *race* would not yield the best results. Logically, these ought to come from saving and perpetuating the *best people*. Ethnicity is one of the criteria we must take into account, but it's not the most important or the decisive one.

To implement alternative 3 we must first decide which characteristics we find desirable. We must determine a proper objective for our species to pursue and identify the genetic and cultural traits that lead to it. After extensive debates, proper trials and countless corrections, once such criteria has been agreed upon tests should be developed and applied to every human being,

allowing us to accurately detect *desirable* and *undesirable* individuals.

Those who pass the test should be allowed to live their lives however they see fit and to have kids (the higher above the bar they score, the more children they ought to be allowed and [initially] encouraged to have). Those who fail it should be free to live their lives however they see fit just as well, but they can't be allowed to reproduce - *no matter what*.

To that end, the undesirables could be sterilized or, as an alternative that is likely to be more politically achievable, to be severely penalized for having children. They have such a mechanism already in place in China, but I'm not really familiar with it. Thus, without basing my suggestions on anyone else's tried-and-tested methods, I would advise something in the lines of: depriving undesirables who illegally have children from any and all social benefits; barring them access to health services (public and private); heavily over-taxing them based on the number of children they've had; and/or executing them alongside their progeny (the children, in a humane way. The parents, not necessarily).

Those suggestions may sound harsh or even insane to some. But to those who are literally crazy, that's exactly what reason is supposed to sound like. And people deemed undesirable *must* be eradicated - since reducing suffering is our utmost priority, this supersedes multiplying the best among us.

The easy way to do that is mass sterilization, but its subjects wouldn't peacefully go along with it since the worse someone is the less they care about the well-being of others, and the farthest they are willing to go to perpetuate their own flaws and continue with their destructive existence. Those who should cease to exist are the ones who are likely to refuse to do so the most, so violent means would have to be adopted and some pain (as little as possible) would, consequently, have to be caused to them.

People with higher intelligence and better education have the least children, and that's because they know multiplying human beings is a mistake. They know having a child is a great responsibility, that it takes a lot of work to raise one properly, and that doing so costs a fortune that must be paid for with their own money, freedom, happiness, time, and comfort. When decent people want to have kids anyway, they have one or two at most. Meanwhile, those who are

utterly irresponsible and entirely incompetent reproduce like rats, because wearing a condom is too complicated for them, they couldn't care less about how their kids will turn out or about what havoc these will unleash upon the world once they've grown, and they don't know how to do anything other than to fuck each other. Thus, the measures I previously suggested aren't really harsh – they are proportional to the mentality and behavior of those who should be subjected to them. I'd say they're gentle even. And so long as the measures we adopt are proportional to the crime committed, even the most drastic ones are *just* and thus right.

Returning to the options we have to achieve homogeneity:

Alternative 1 (choosing one group of people) may work. It might in Russia or China but, in the West, we've practically locked ourselves out of this path. Sooner or later, there'll be war between Occident and Orient because our diverging ideologies and mentalities cannot share a planet. If the involved populations' *unity* turns out to be the decisive factor of that war – and that *is* an important factor – China will win and we'll lose, as both should. But China's regime and its people have their flaws, and they would then have to go to war against the rest of the world anyway, before they were finally the only ones left on Earth. The Chinese might emerge victorious and humanity may finally be united and pacified, but billions would have to suffer for it.

Alternative 2 (randomly mixing everyone up) is the path the Western world set itself upon. It's the worst of all, and I don't believe it *can* succeed. This "choice" (however accidental it probably was) may lead to the demise of the American and European societies in the relatively near future – maybe even within a couple of centuries, if people keep pushing the social-liberal agenda as far and hard as they continue to. By irresponsibly admitting immigrants and incompetently managing them, Western societies are now formed by myriad of different ethnic and religious groups which disagree with and hate one another. Those people naturally go for each other's throats, and this is added on top of the populist tactics of socialists, who keep constantly inciting conflict between men and women, heterosexuals and homosexuals, the rich and the poor. And even without government- and media-engineered populism, mutual hatred and in-fighting could still be easily sowed by foreign agents in such fertile grounds (and it is). Those warring groups of people will

never understand each other, get along or work together, and the path to victory, for each and every one of them, in a democracy, consists in *increasing their numbers* so that one group's will overcomes all others'. And increasing the number of humans on Earth is the opposite of what we have to do, as it leads to nothing but ever-growing problems.

If this second path doesn't lead to endless wars among "ourselves" (as, historically, it always has), in the best case scenario it should leave us with a mediocre population (*if* most people decided to copulate with those who are not the same as them *and* we survived long enough for everyone to get randomly mixed up). Reaching some acceptable level of homogeneity following this path could take hundreds, perhaps even thousands of years, and I don't think it's even possible. If it is, the end result would still be an undesirable cultural and genetic mess.

Alternative 3 (to allow only desirable people to reproduce) is the way to go. It is politically achievable, a part of it (that can be further tweaked and eventually perfected) has already been successfully implemented in China, and it doesn't separate people by race, language or origins, but by *luck* and *merit* (however undesirable, the first is inevitable). It selects those who should survive one by one, without generalizing. It encourages those who should be encouraged, spares those who should be spared and eliminates those who must be eliminated.

The third alternative should leave us with the best genetic pool and culture, so long as proper criteria is established to identify "desirable" and "undesirable" people. Its mix of genes would lead to a better genetic outcome than that of the other options, much faster and with much less conflict. This can be applied globally, without requiring countries to go to war against each other – those selected to multiply and survive would think, "Those people [across borders and oceans] are [still] not *exactly* like me," but then they'd also think, "And yet they are *just as good* as me." This should be enough for us to develop a common sense and find some common ground.

We can do things reasonably, or let nature follow its course and kill us all. It's not a difficult choice.

Some won't believe this and many more will refuse to, but only *after* writing this whole topic did I learn there's a thing called "eugenics." So I should probably make some clarifications.

Everything I said was a conclusion reached independently by me, not based on anybody's previous works. I'm not a neo-Nazi, I never had any connections to anyone who is, I think Hitler was [mostly] a lunatic, and that what the Nazis ultimately did to the Jews (beyond trying to expel them from Germany) and others was a disgrace. But the Third Reich wasn't wrong about everything.

To simplify reality so that our feeble minds can make some sense out of it, we tend to define anything as "*absolutely* right" or "*completely* wrong." And in the present case the Jewish propaganda machine works 24/7 at full steam to make sure we do so. Thanks to Israel and other parts of the Jewish community, unless we all forever criticize every single thing the Nazis did or believed in, we are now automatically and severely punished in our own countries, by our own people. But just like the Nazis' tanks and planes were better than everyone else's at the beginning of WWII, the atomic bomb and space-rocket technologies they developed (before anyone else) worked just fine, and their propaganda and battlefield tactics were so efficient that they are still abundantly used today (including by Israel itself), some of their other methods, as well as part of their ideals, were just as undeniably valid. And eugenics falls into this category.

The problem with eugenics is that the Nazis *implemented* it poorly, assuming themselves to be "the superior race" for ideological reasons and political goals. The Americans did something similar in the early 20th century, with 30 of its states passing laws that allowed the forceful sterilization of undesirable people, using mental disabilities, financial status and skin color as criteria for defining "desirables" and "undesirables"¹² (I thought I had come up with such terms, but it turns out that the original eugenics ideology uses the exact same ones. As it happens with the title of this topic, they are just the most fitting words for the intended meaning.)

The problem is not eugenics itself, but the *criteria* used to apply it. Denying its validity and prohibiting it from being seriously reconsidered is the same as banishing democracy because the first time it was attempted, a long time ago in Greece, it was a complete

¹² **Wikipedia entry:** https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugenics_in_the_United_States (Accessed in July, 2025).

failure; or declaring that one plus one is not two because someone doing an equation once made a mistake and reached the wrong result. No – as it happens with basic math but *not* with democracy (which people nonetheless defend), the logical foundation of eugenics is true and solid.

We were on the right track, put a perfectly good idea poorly into practice, and then stupidly convinced ourselves to abandon it. Later on, thanks to the Nazis (mainly), we made even reconsidering it illegal. But the fact is we *must* eugenicize our species, because reason dictates so – this *is* the logical path the universe laid out for intelligent species to evolve beyond a certain point. There is no other.

How are we going to evolve now, if simply suggesting using eugenics gets us censored, persecuted and incarcerated?

Most likely, we won't.

As a final, tangential point: I just had a “silly” (maybe, maybe not) idea of *how* we might be able detect whether a person can be considered “desirable” or “undesirable.” This ought to appeal more to Gen Zs, sociologists, and democrats than to engineers, programmers and anyone with a PhD, but it should at least constitute an interesting hypothetical experiment.

We could implement a system, built around a website, that allows people to *rate each other*. Every person would be automatically registered in it and we could look anyone up in the system and give them a vote in “honesty/dishonesty,” “greedy/generous,” “sincere/sly,” “diligent/lazy”, etc. This would build up our individual profiles, which an AI could then analyze to determine who among us is a decent person and who isn't. Users' ratings would be public, but votes anonymous (of course).

The most immediate problem with this idea is that the system wouldn't be perfectly fair, since it would be based on *people's* opinions, which are intrinsically flawed. Many would try to hack it by “downvoting” those they have a personal gripe with, while other people would “trend” simply because they are “cute.” But someone who cast such “misvotes” would be likely to end up with a poor rating themselves, meaning none of their votes would count much towards other people's ratings (something automatically calculated

by the system's AI). Others would instead try to forge a better score than they deserve, but to do so they would have to actually treat other people better, which is not only positive in itself but also a way to directly *condition* one's behavior.

This sounds like a very silly idea, but in a world filled with smartphone-addicted addled-brains it actually does make a sickening kind of sense. And it would be fun to adopt it just to see what happened. With an *AI* in charge, who knows? It could even end up working.

Let's just call this our "plan B." It might come in handy if we never manage to agree on a more scientific method for separating the wheat from the chaff.

CHAPTER III: How to Rule the World

Summarizing our flaws, we can say our species is *insane*. We are all trapped in a planet-sized mental asylum, the patients are running the place, and the scant physicians around are slightly different versions of Dr. Jekyll. That's essentially why our government systems don't work, our social policies are unfair and our economy constantly hangs by a thread; why our judiciaries don't do justice, our legislative bodies are corrupt, and our executives incompetent.

Identically to stupidity, the irony of insanity is that it's unable to acknowledge itself. If you are stupid, you are not smart enough to realize it; and to be crazy indeed, you must truly believe you aren't. Neither of those maladies can be healed by time alone or by the ailing themselves and, to varying degrees, we are all afflicted by both of them. We must evolve, but doing so requires fixing our broken nature and this doesn't happen by accident.

Being currently unable to cure humanity's actual disease, we must work on trying to alleviate its symptoms. And the most flaring one, the visible red rash covering our species entire skin, is *politics*.

As a preface to this chapter, I must note that our policies are preceded by and based upon *ideologies*, and different political *spectrums* have been designed to try and accommodate all of them. Regardless of which such spectrum is the most accurate, we must keep in mind that politics is not just about "left" and "right" - it's also about the "top," the "bottom," and everything in between these four axes. We don't have to, and few of us actually do land on any of those extremes. Ideologically, each one of us fits in a particular X, Y coordinate between them: one can be liberal regarding gay marriage, conservative about abortion, defend large-scale social benefits and strongly stand by private property rights, while also believing a state should not interfere with the economy and that everyone is entitled to carry arms and violently defend their rights.

With that being said, instead of dealing with the whole political spectrum and all of its pre-made ideologies, in this chapter I'll talk about some particular points of it, a few aspects of our economy, and our societal structures, many of which I believe we should seriously reconsider, drastically improve upon, or perhaps even rebuild from the ground up.

Capitalism

The free market is beautiful, isn't it?

No. It turned out to be quite horrible.

We are all aware of the 1929 crash, the Subprime crisis, of Ponzi pyramids, drained pension funds, big bank bail-outs and Wall Street orgies. After all that, we can only say pure, completely free capitalism is a good thing if we set the bar very, very low. And we'd still be fooling ourselves.

Some state regulation is *necessary*. We cannot let the market regulate itself because, whenever it does, greedy psychopaths take charge and keep ruining all of our lives over and over again for needless personal gain, as they always have.

We act as if all that defines us is this one number stored away in a hidden server inside a secret facility somewhere unknown: the balance in our bank account. People tend to see it as their personal high-score in the game of life. And just as we need rules and anti-cheating measures in any game, we need them in real life too, for the same reason: because *humans* are playing.

Without rules and regulations, being a businessman you don't beat your competitors with a better product, a good training program and generous employee benefits. No - you beat them with hyping and a complete lack of ethics. You beat them by profiling the hell out of your clients, exploiting and selectively sharing their private information, sabotaging competing businesses' infrastructure, spying on them, stealing their intellectual property, lobbying, bribing authorities, practicing insider trading and hiring lawyers to make sure anything you do is, for all effects and purposes, considered "strictly legal."

In business, as in anything else, those who completely ignore the rules and ethical principles win. And once someone has too much money, no one else is able to compete against them - ever again - unless we have counter-measures and adequate punishments in place to hold cheating Billion Boy in check.

Owning a business and having an endless fortune, if another company dares to compete against yours you can simply buy them out. If they won't sell, you may attempt a hostile takeover. If that

fails, you proceed to predatorily price your products. If the competition still manages to survive, you then smear their company's or products' image, sabotage their assets, threaten, kidnap or kill their executives and major shareholders. If you do any of that, a swarm of unscrupulous lawyers will be more than happy to "prove" your "innocence," or to at least hide your guilt long enough for you to die of old age before taking a single step inside a prison or even court. If they are ever about to fail in doing so, politicians on sale abound at your nearest Congress or Parliament, eager to change any law that might inconvenience you for an exorbitant friends-and-family price. Or, if you are rich enough to play golf in certain fields, you can simply ask for, and be freely granted, a presidential pardon. Regardless, if things ever start to heat up, you can wait for the dust to settle by travelling around the globe in your yacht and, in the worst case scenario, if you end up being found, caught, tried and convicted, your "punishment" will simply be to spend a couple of years vacationing inside one of the many mansions and penthouses you purchased with other people's money.

Without regulations, Jeff Bezos, Zuckerberg, Bill Gates, Steve Jobs (thankfully dead), stock brokers and others like them are free to spy and censor, to install whatever they want in our computers and smartphones, to overprice their products and services, to manipulate the market, etc., exploiting and stealing from billions of people at will, potentially holding entire populations hostage to their sociopathic egos. That's why we have antitrust laws in place, and why those bound by them are constantly trying to tear them apart.

As a concrete example that you may be personally familiar with, consider Apple's iTunes. You purchase a smartphone for a small fortune, but it doesn't become yours. No - Apple decided it owns your device even if you paid for it, and there's nothing you can do about that. Apple's many lawyers are all much better than your single one so, legally, its greed matters far more than your consumer rights. If you want to use iTunes for some reason, perhaps to back up your contacts, you are forced to upload *all* the information contained in your device to Apple's servers. What the company does with the private information contained in your phone or pad is anyone's guess, but no one can stop them from doing *whatever* they want with it. If you wish to simply update your iOS to be able to run newer software on your iPhone, you are forced to purchase a new device every few years, because Apple blocks older ones from being updated for no reason other than to extort more money from you (I can't see why a slightly older phone wouldn't be able to run a newer

OS, or why an updated OS wouldn't be backwards compatible with older, nearly-identical models. That incompatibility must be deliberately coded in).

My favorite example is Microsoft, though. With Windows 10, they have effectively kidnapped about 90% of all personal computers on the planet. We are *forced* to update it, and they can insert any piece of code they want into our machines, whenever they want and without our consent. Not to mention Windows 10 also constantly sends data about our private activity on our personal computers to Microsoft, and no one knows what, exactly, is being sent. And how many backdoors they put into this spyware disguised as an OS only Billy and the NSA know. (Just in case it's not obvious to you that they do that: why do you think not a single computer used by the Russian and Chinese governments runs on Windows?)

Thanks to the greed of the people running such companies and to the shareholding scheme that further feeds it, there must be rules and these must be strongly enforced. We cannot allow one or a few sick people to disrupt the lives of millions or billions of others to the extent they still do by rendering them unaccountable and the rest of us legally defenseless.

Stock market professionals are, of course, another great example. The movie *Dumb Money*, based on real recent events, begins by stating that's how Wall Street bankers and fund managers refer to retail investors - they call these (us) "dumb money" because the system is so rigged in the big players' favor that anyone who invests in the stock market on their own is *bound* to lose money, stupidly giving it away to those who already have too much without having actually earned any of it.

The job of stock brokers, bankers, hedge fund managers and the such is to *manipulate* the market; it is to lie to everyone at all times and take as much money from as many people as they possibly can under false premises and promises. Though it was supposed to serve a constructive purpose, the modern stock market is nothing more than a gambling den run by scammers (if they haven't already delegated it entirely to AIs).

In some other movie, I remember a character saying that the oldest joke in Wall Street is: "This time, it will be different!" As if manipulating the market in an anti-Robin Hood drive to steal from those who have little to give to those who have far too much wasn't enough, financial agents go beyond, in fact *engineering* whole new

crises as their greed feeds on everyone else's work and savings. The subprime crisis, for one, was directly caused by them – they knew what was going to happen (because it was obvious) and went ahead with it anyway. Wall Street sharks have gone and will always be willing to go as far as breaking the entire global economy, bankrupting every person on the planet if necessary, so long as they come out of it even richer.

That's one more argument as to why we need to police greedy people and to limit their operational freedom, at least until we collectively realize we'd be better off by simply killing them all.

People believe capitalism is a beautiful thing because it allows any of us to become rich. But we seem to forget that money *equates* to work. Someone somewhere had to *do* something to earn every penny that has been minted, every bill that has been printed, every number that has been added to a bank's data center (except when governments print money).

Most of us can build or do something that someone else wants or needs done. Some of our crafts are simple, others are complex; some are easy, others hard; some require decades of studying and training, others require neither; some are quickly done, others can take decades. But they all have a relative worth, an *intrinsic value* that is comparable to any other [useful] activity and which is essentially based on the very criteria I just mentioned – e.g., a cow is worth two sheep; erecting a house is worth knitting one hundred and fifty sweaters; draining a clogged pipe is worth making six cheeseburgers; building a dam is worth hauling 150 million tonnes of iron ore across the Pacific.

Whenever money changes hands, in one way or another it reflects real work done. Pecuniary transactions represent the exchange of an X amount of work A for a Y amount of work B, where X times the difficulty of A *supposedly* equates to Y times the difficulty of B ($Ax = By$).

If you gain more than your work is worth, someone else will have gained less than theirs is. What should belong to them now belongs to you, even though you didn't earn and don't deserve it – willingly or not, you *stole* it. That means that anyone who has too much money is, inevitably, a thief, because it's not possible for one to have done enough concrete, useful things to, by the time they are 25 years old,

have US\$100 million. One entire lifetime is not enough for anyone to earn US\$1 billion, because no work that *can* be done by a single person *has* that much value.

The only way to accumulate an excessive amount of money is to steal someone else's actual work. Stealing their work means to steal their time and effort which, in turn, means to steal a chunk of their very lives. As you accrue more than you actually earned, at certain thresholds you'll have stolen more than most people make in a lifetime; you'll have taken a whole life of someone else's work for yourself. Every time you reach one such threshold, you'll have made an entire life go unrewarded; you'll have effectively tortured and killed a man.

The "beauty" of capitalism is not simply that it allows people to get rich - it is that it allows a single person to keep the profit of *many others'* labors for themselves. It allows for a single person to indirectly kill thousands of people and be rewarded for it. That's what it actually means "to be rich," because it's the only way to become so. (Wealth levels below "rich" but still far above average can still be fairly achieved.)

Thanks to everything I've just said, I believe we should have mechanisms to prohibit companies from charging for their products and services much more than these are actually worth, and also to prohibit them from paying their employees far less than these ones contribute to making or providing those products and services.

Another reason why we need to regulate the economy is because people in general don't *know* how much work goes into making something, how long it takes, and how much it costs to do so. Other than for some of those who work for a given company, none of us can accurately tell how much its products are actually worth. We have no means to accurately determine whether we are being fairly charged for something or being ripped off instead.

We *believe* we can discern how much we should pay for a product or service, that we know how much what we are considering purchasing is worth compared to the work we, ourselves, had to do to afford it. But we have no idea. We don't know how much study, research, practice, time, pain and financial investment went into creating anything we didn't create ourselves. And we also have a tendency to overvalue our own work and undervalue other people's,

which causes us to haggle, ask for discounts, or ultimately refrain from buying something we can afford even if its price is actually fair.

Taking human arrogance and ignorance strategically into account, large companies charge us, as an example, US\$1,500 for a smartphone that costs US\$400 to be made and delivered. It is true that a large amount of money goes into researching and prototyping a new product, establishing a production line, a logistics chain, and perfecting them all. So, initially, the seemingly-excessive price charged for a product is somewhat justifiable, since companies need to break even on their investments. But once they do, they still don't proportionately lower their prices – a smartphone's may drop from US\$1,500 to US\$1,000, but the raw material, labor, maintenance, utilities, and logistics costs required to make it remain [roughly] the same. The manufacturer's profit margin might be somewhat reduced, but it remains *abusive*.

Some may justify the above on the basis that a company needs to think ahead, to save money for its future endeavors and make its shareholders happy, so let me use a more uncontroversial example: chemotherapy drugs. Big Pharma charges dying patients who have no other options more than US\$10,000 for 30 tiny pills (which cost only a couple of dollars to produce) in a blatant attempt to extort literally everything a person managed to accrue in an entire lifetime of work. Even if we take into account high research costs, regulatory-agencies' processes, clinical trials and the rest of the pharmaceutical ecosystem, as well as the time it takes to navigate it, that price tag is completely unjustifiable. You'd think pharmaceutical companies would charge people less for those drugs once their initial investments had been recovered and reserves for future R&D projects had been stashed away, but I checked and at least one such drug costs *more* nowadays than it did 10 years ago, when it was initially released (AstraZeneca profited more than US\$5.4 billion with this single drug, *Tagrisso*, in the year of 2022 alone).

We purchase those drugs because, if we don't, we die. But we also pay ludicrously for common products (such as smartphones), *allowing* ourselves to be robbed. Why?

First, because the manufacturer has the product's intellectual property, so they are legally allowed to charge however much they want for it. Once they lose the monopoly and other companies start manufacturing similar products, they tend to form a cartel to continue fixing the prices. Second, because the consumer often has no choice: either we buy a certain product for the asking price, or we

are left without it. And third, because once someone *else* pays more than they should for something, we start thinking that paying so much for it is *not* insane. We do wonder if it is actually worth so much, but as the number of people who effectively purchase that product increases, the more convinced the rest of us gets that it actually is – we foolishly trust our peers, hopping happily off a cliff after them, as always.

Thus, once again, certain aspects of the economy *must* be regulated: patents must, sometimes, be broken; anti-trust laws must be enacted; and companies shouldn't be allowed to extort customers, overprice their products, overpay their executives or underpay their employees. When businesses don't act fairly on their own, they must be forced to, just like any individual [should be].

As a concrete measure against our global lack of understanding of any product's actual value, I'd suggest making the manufacturing costs of everything publicly available, stamped right onto the juice box and milk carton, so that we'd all have the means to accurately judge, on our own, whether something is worth its asking price or not. Any self-respecting company already has those numbers; they are just kept hidden from the public.

As a side note: *planned obsolescence* (for a company to deliberately sabotage its own products so as to force consumers to buy new ones) should be criminalized everywhere, as France did in 2015. Most countries have no laws whatsoever against it, while the EU, some other individual European countries, Brazil and the United States have only make-believe ones (of course, otherwise the CEOs of Apple, Microsoft and countless other companies would all end up in jail, and then they'd miss a couple of parties with the people who are supposed to legislate over them).

To spare wealthy, well-connected folks from any harm and keep the economy spinning faster than it *ever* should, we waste vast amounts of natural resources plus the work and whole life of countless people. And I don't see any purpose behind this other than to make filthy rich people even filthier. Ahem... I meant to say "richer."

Planned obsolescence is the acme of malpractice. And it is allowed everywhere (except in France) because no one on Earth has yet figured out how to properly manage an economy (I'll give them a hint: it begins with population control).

Getting back to our main topic, and as another independent point about the capitalist ideology flaws, we have some of its subscribers defending that no company should *ever* belong to the state; that they should all be privately owned. That might even be valid as a rule (if the market is properly regulated), but there are necessary exceptions.

Essential services such as water treatment, energy generation and distribution, road construction and maintenance, military-grade weapons manufacturing, etc. *must* remain under the state's control. Private ownership of such industries can lead to basic needs being severed from the population at one man's whim, or to another one single-handedly deciding the outcome of a war by choosing to provide the weapons he manufactures exclusively to one side of a conflict (a side he, alone, gets to pick).

Bureaucracy is always inefficient, as is red-tape an inescapable nightmare. But in certain cases they are the lesser evil. Having, for example, a company such as Enron literally blacking-out the state of California for ransom is a far worse scenario.

Total economic freedom is a catastrophe, because *we* are not good enough to handle it. This has been proven time and again by multiple crises and we still have not fixed what we know is wrong. In the US, they always seem to be heading in the opposite direction, breeding the next global financial cataclysm behind closed curtains while yet again swearing to the whole world it can't possibly happen.

The entire industry must be regulated, because an unregulated one strongly favors those who do virtually nothing (company owners and executives) while mercilessly exploiting those who do everything (actual workers). It helps the richest businessmen get even richer while making everyone else poorer. And by siphoning the value of actual work into the pockets of those who do nothing, an unregulated market effectively turns people into slaves, destroying billions of lives.

It's true that without the possibility for one to have more than others hardly anyone would be encouraged to chase after anything, to seek discovery and invention, to doubt the consensus and contradict the impossible, to dare and advance. But there must be *balance* between merit and reward. And this balance won't be randomly achieved through blind luck. It won't happen without us actively seeking it,

because equilibrium cannot be achieved while those who strive to destroy it are *allowed* to.

Communism/Socialism

For starters, let's forget about communism. Marx defined it as a system without government, without a state – it's an anarchy. It completely disregards human nature, being a juvenile, completely impracticable idea. Karl probably came up with it just as a mental exercise, knowing full well it was an intangible utopia (at least for his time and ours). Since communism has no chance of working as it was designed to anytime soon, it's not worth considering.

The people we often call “communists” are just *socialists*. To varying degrees, that would be Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, Fidel Castro, Angela Merkel, the American Democrats. They are “redistributors” – people who believe stealing by force what was earned by some and freely giving it to others, who in the vast majority of cases don't deserve it, is *not* theft.

Another thing socialists have in common – among themselves and with fascists – is that they all defend a strong state. To those folks, the state is responsible for providing *everything* to its citizens. And when implemented, such belief and its ensuing policies lead people to depend directly on the government and its bureaucracy to fulfill all of their needs, becoming unable to survive without aid from the state and being left with no option but to *defend* the government, regardless of how much it abuses them and everyone else. Thus, the left wing of human society is comprised, or rather *led*, by nothing but paternalists who aim to submit entire populations into slavery.

To achieve that end, socialists use a series of standard strategies which include but are not limited to: disarming the population, so that it has no means to defend itself against the police; destroying the economy and the private sector, so that people are forced to rely on public jobs and social benefits to survive; using populist tactics and speeches to pit classes of people against each other, so that an organized civil society cannot possibly exist to oppose those in power; forging history and inserting propaganda into didactic material, to brainwash children and teenagers into blindly defending the socialist cause; drastically lowering the quality of

education, to keep people ignorant and gullible enough to believe whatever he who oppresses them wants them to; using demagoguery to manipulate and control the intellectually disfavored portion of the population which, ideally for socialists, should be all of it; etc.

Each of those strategies branches out into varied tactics, but there's no point in going into further details. Suffice it to say that I have seen all the ones I mentioned being implemented. Those measures were and continue to be put into practice in many countries all over the world, including mine. *And they work.*

Where those practices lead has already been made clear by history: straight to hell (also known as "North Korea," "Cuba," "Venezuela," "Bolivia," etc.). But socialists have been honing their insidious methods for over a century now, and they have become quite efficient at destroying nations. Despite overwhelming evidence of all the disgrace their ideology causes, people still fall for it. So don't underestimate those pulling the leftist strings - the people who believe in them are simply ignorant and naive, but the ones holding their leashes are quite cunning and very dangerous.

Socialism doesn't work. When income is artificially (and *poorly*) redistributed among the population, those who deserve more stop working, because they are being treated unfairly. Those who do nothing get paid and consume, while not contributing a single calorie to increasing a country's GDP. *Unreasonably* altering the natural flow of money causes production to dwindle. Demand grows, but it can't be met. Goods and services become scarce, leaving people's basic needs unfulfilled. The armed forces and police grow larger, to keep the starving, rebellious population in violent check. Their own salaries drastically increase, to keep those carrying arms from rebelling against the government. And since both police officers and military personnel are part of those who consume but do not contribute to the economy, this one disintegrates. A country's entire population becomes miserably poor. Nothing works, people suffer, people flee, people die, and this can keep going on for a very long time.

Socialism's only silver lining is that it's bound to crumble sooner or later because, at some point, either those who are armed will revolt along with everyone else, or even the highest echelon of the government will begin to starve, in which case they'll abandon their office, wash their hands, flee to Russia, and let someone else try to

fix the abominable mess they caused. If none of that happens, either the socialist country in question will become stagnated due to rendering its own citizens stupid, uneducated and useless or, if a socialist regime ever decides to try doing the opposite – to *improve* education – a large percentage of the population will refuse to work and/or opt to leave the country, making it completely unable to function or defend itself. In any case, socialism ultimately dies. But once it does, it can turn into anarchy, which is even worse.

Socialists preach freedom, but do everything they can to reduce it. Try to argue with a “social justice warrior” and you’ll see they are the first ones to censor others and to verbally and physically assault anyone who disagrees with them. They never have any actual argument, and they can never foresee the consequences of the policies they so aggressively defend. Thus they tend to resort to personal attacks and self-victimization, as is the go-to move of all those who are guilty.

What socialists want is to *steal* what others have, instead of to create something. They want more rights for themselves and less for everyone else. Their modus operandi is to feed people lies and fantasies, forming an army of “useful idiots” that they can then maneuver to fulfill their true goal, which is exactly the same as the worst capitalists’: to enrich and empower themselves. They are criminals, nothing more.

Note that I’m referring to how socialism works in *practice*. The socialist ideology, on its own, if reasonably considered and properly implemented, does have a few merits.

I don’t need to say more about [practical] socialism. You are certainly well aware of how people in Cuba crave food, what an average Russian home looks like, how messed up everything about North Korea is, how transparent China’s official Covid numbers were or how well paid most of their workers are. It’s no coincidence that no one wants to move into any of those countries and millions want out of them (China, in particular, seems to be getting better though).

Any system that relies on theft is self-destructive. Any system that hinges on mankind’s [supposedly] good nature to work doesn’t. Any system that treats different people as equals is unfair. And as an unfair, self-destructive system that doesn’t work, socialism ultimately generates nothing but destruction and loss, misfortune and grief.

Now, let me share my opinion about some specific topics of the socialist/liberal agenda:

Immigration:

All countries should let the educated, *useful* immigrants in, and bar all others.

No one would let an ignorant, ill-mannered, dirty and useless hobo who doesn't even speak their language inside their homes, to live there, with them and their families, forever. Then why should anyone let such people into their *country*? It's the same thing: a person's city is the extension of their home, the state (the territorial division, not the sovereign entity) is an extension of their city, and the country is an extension of their state. By the transitive property, letting someone into your country is the same as letting them into your own home, and whether you allow them in or not ought to be considered on the exact same grounds.

About a century ago, hordes of immigrants were welcomed with open arms in the Americas because unqualified labor was necessary to build multiple cities from the ground up. New countries and entire new economies were being created, putting menial manual labor in high demand. Nowadays, unqualified workers are no longer needed anywhere, because they naturally abound on every corner of the planet.

I don't know why people even argue about this. Immigrants' problems are not *your* problems. You didn't cause the issues they are trying to move away from or condemned any of those people to life. Your government has no obligation – not even *moral* – to let anyone into your country, especially because doing so without criteria is bound to cause a lot more harm to the local population than to benefit the immigrants themselves (again: unless these are decent, well educated and useful people, who also adapt and mingle instead of segregating themselves).

Refugees are a similar but slightly different issue.

Refugees differ from immigrants because they are fleeing from something terrible. They *must* do so, as any reasonable person would. Thus, dealing with them is not just a social and economic issue, but also a moral one.

Although morally speaking helping refugees seems to be the right thing to do, it isn't. It isn't because letting those people into your country – especially in such large numbers as refugees usually come in – will inevitably lead to a lot of problems being created to you and yours. When people who share genetic traits, a culture and a language migrate in hordes, they try to create a new society for themselves wherever they end up at. Instead of adopting the local culture and way of life, swarms of people insist on keeping theirs and trying to change the local one. They start reproducing in large numbers, and eventually attempt to impose their ways and ideologies on everyone else. And those are the people who planted the seeds of another country's destruction, meaning that, if they successfully infect yours, your country will go up in flames just like theirs did – and then *you* will have to flee from it, leaving all you've ever achieved behind.

Refugees run away from the fruits of their own labors. They elected a tyrant to lead their country, or let one take charge; their police and armed forces failed to oust him; their culture made these last ones and their country's politicians dishonest, incompetent and corrupt; they couldn't fix the situation they created and had to flee from it. *They* are the problem.

If you don't want to suffer the same fate as them, you don't want those people living and multiplying anywhere near you. To allow that based on moral grounds is the same as to grab a vial of smallpox and inject it into your bloodstream just so that there's less smallpox roaming free elsewhere. The logical thing to do while we don't manage to eradicate the "smallpox virus" is not to infect ourselves with it, but to keep it as far away as possible from healthy organisms and let it die on its own.

The final sum of sheltering refugees is negative. The smartest people from a disgraced country move out of it *first*, because they can see the dark clouds looming over the horizon. They emigrate sooner and in small numbers. When the word "refugee" is said out loud, that means some 99% of those counted among them are "late ones" – those who had to wait until shit hit them right in the face to realize it wasn't chocolate. And that means 99% of them are useless to you or anyone else, and that they shouldn't be allowed into *any* country. They ought to be kept in theirs, to fairly reap what they sowed.

As it happens with immigrants, [the very few] *qualified* refugees can be given a chance by another nation. More leniency can also

be given to people from a particular country or culture who are collectively known to be decent and to quickly adapt to a new way of life instead of creating ghettos and antagonizing others (e.g., far more Canadians can be allowed into a country than Jews). Those are the two exceptions to the rule. All other refugees should be left to fend for themselves, because when helping someone causes more damage than it avoids, it doesn't help at all.

When the Jewish people were absorbed by the Roman Empire, they kept revolting because they wanted everyone else to worship *their* God and adhere to *their* moral principles. When Muslims were freely allowed into Europe and the United States, a wave of "terrorist" attacks ensued, with hundreds of "innocent" people being killed. Once a critical number of Russians lived in certain regions of Ukraine, Russia used them as an excuse (a premeditated one) to invade its neighbor and occupy a part of it, with massive help from spies and traitors living there. And whenever too many people – such as in a wave of refugees – are let into another country, things like that are *bound* to happen. Most of those migrating aren't simply going to be economically useless, but they'll also stick to their native language and culture, refusing to learn and assimilate new ones. A part of them will be formed by religious or political fanatics, most will remain forever loyal to their homeland, and a few of them will be actual agents deliberately sent to spy on and destroy the sanctuary-providing country from within.

Letting large numbers of refugees into another society is never worth the risk. Their diasporas have long been weaponized, and no country *has* to accept them. "But look! They have children with them!" Yeah, well... they shouldn't have had any, because what any refugee is ever running from has always been brewing since *long* before their kids were born. If they failed to see it, that's once again on them, not on anyone else. To save their children you'd have to sacrifice your own – so let theirs die.

Like I said earlier, unlike dealing with common immigrants, handling refugees is in good part a *moral* issue. Being so, such decisions have been encompassed by the imbecility of "human rights." And thanks to this, countries that should know better opened their doors wide open to those people in the past and, even though they all regret it, they still coerce themselves into continuing to do so. European countries and the US should *ignore* [at least part of] the human rights treaties they've signed. No one

on the planet respects international law, the UN is nothing but an expensive joke and the ICJ a powerless parody of a court. For first-world countries, taking refugees in and sabotaging their own nations for the sake of misguided laws that serve only as a weapon to their enemies is sheer stupidity.

Although it constantly tries, pity does *not* justify the abdication of reason.

It's curious that people fleeing their country always seek to relocate to Europe, Canada or the United States instead of seeking refuge in Africa, China, or Latin America, isn't it?

Most refugees don't try to simply get to safety and start a new life. Muslim ones, for instance, don't go to other Islamic nations. No – they go to Europe. And that implies they are not simply fleeing from something – what they are doing is *taking advantage* of an opportunity to freely land into a world that someone else created, in a country someone else built, in a place where they don't deserve to live (since they failed to create a similar or better one for themselves). They think they're smart, but you are not an idiot. So don't be fooled.

If any immigrants or refugees are allowed into your country, they must adopt your culture and language, not spread theirs. Otherwise, they are not trying to join in – they are trying to *take over*. You and your ancestors murdered the previous owners of these lands, raped their women, burnt their crops, killed most of the wildlife, violated the natives' sacred burial grounds, built flimsy structures upon them and created a proud, sprawling nation filled with problems. They didn't.

In your country, it's your way or the highway. To take over, immigrants will have to kill you. And depending on whom you let in, they *will* try as soon as they have the numbers.

Legal Equality:

This is fair. As living beings we do, naturally, all have the same rights. But left-wing militants these days are not pushing for equal rights – they are pushing for *more* rights. It's "unacceptable!" for anyone to have more than them, but they think it's fine for them to have more than everyone else.

Where I live, by law, 50% of public universities' spots are set aside for students coming from public high schools (supposedly, for the poor). Then, out of those 50%, another percentage is reserved for black people. So if a couple paid a lot of money for their kid to study, this one did so diligently, passed the tests and made the cut, a black kid who never had to pay to go to school, failed to learn anything in it even though *others* paid for them to, literally can't read and scored a tenth of what the first one did by randomly selecting alternatives will steal the white kid's spot in one of the country's best universities. And the latter, who *deserves* to be in there, will be left out of college. Seriously: how illogically, immorally, criminally and unconstitutionally racist is that?

What about female tennis players being paid the same as male ones? In Grand Slams, they play best-of-three-sets matches while men play best-of-five. In such tournaments, women's games average 1 hour and 20 minutes in length, while men's average 3 hours. And yet men and women get the exact same prizes, despite female players working only half as much as male ones do and entertaining the audience for about half as long, effectively accruing only half as much money for the tournament itself (and I'm being generous here, since men's matches draw in considerably more than twice the women's audience). There's no plausible excuse for that; it's completely absurd. For female tennis players to be paid the same, the extra money they are making is being directly stolen from the men.

Is there a gay parade where you live? There's one where I do. One day a year is set aside for homosexuals dressed in drag and wearing assless chaps to shamelessly showcase their "pride" by closing off some major arteries in the city and worsening traffic. First: what the hell are they proud of? Second: what gives them the right to interfere with thousands of other people's schedules for no good reason? And third: do you think they'd be okay with it if the rest of us took a day a year off to block streets and showcase our heterosexual pride, waving our dicks in their faces (metaphorically, since they'd probably enjoy it if that was literal)? I seriously doubt it.

We also have things such as maternity leave, which allows parents (regardless of race, gender or sexual orientation, but still constituting a particular group of people) to get several months of paid leave after having a child. Why the hell would anyone pay people *not* to work? A salary is paid for services provided, and

making a baby isn't one. An employee giving birth doesn't help the employer in anything – au contraire, it harms this one due to all the crap entailed in child-rearing and its negative impact on working parents' lives, minds and, consequently, professional performance. People who have kids while being employed should be *fired* instead. If they somehow manage to keep their lives together and heads in place, they might even be kept on the job, but they should never be rewarded – especially at an innocent bystander's (the employer's) expense.

Such policies are unfair, and everything that's unfair harms us all. If black people, women, homosexuals and others were in fact looking for *equal* rights, they would have a hard time finding any opposition.

I agree with what Joaquin Phoenix boldly said on his Oscar acceptance speech, in the middle of a ultra-liberal nest, after winning the statuette of best actor for interpreting the Joker (which I'd also say is one of the most humane characters ever portrayed in the cinema) – to paraphrase him: "We should not be fighting for this gender's rights or arguing what color of life matters. What we should all be fighting for is *justice*."

People who fight for *more* rights actively fight for injustice instead. They must be put down, not encouraged.

Income Redistribution:

There is a proper way to do this, but socialists prefer the other one.

People ought to be paid what they are *worth*: those who know and can do more should be paid more, and those know and can do less should be paid less. That's how things are supposed to work, and the free market is intended to regulate itself, naturally leading to such balance. But thanks to people's greed, it doesn't.

Antisocial economic endeavors and practices ought to be prohibited, and the fortunes some psychopathic businessmen, large companies' executives, bankers, stock brokers, drug dealers and the such have criminally and immorally amassed might as well be confiscated, since it was all stolen from others in the first place. But overtaxing people who *honestly* earned what they have just to freely give what is rightfully theirs to others who didn't merit

anything is criminal and irrational. As a rule, poor people are poor because they should be – they are, indeed, not worth more than their insufficient wages.

Properly regulating the market, as I have previously defended, should achieve a fair distribution of income on its own. Trying to do it via stealing from the *innocent* (as a rule, the middle class) never will.

Private property:

Only left-wing *extremists* would defend the extinction of private property rights, but they are out there somewhere (just follow the scent of weed until you spot a bearded man or hairy woman wearing sandals and a dirty, faded red T-shirt).

Private property is not a human right – it's a *natural* right, a fundamental one. You are born and you'll die with it, regardless of what species you belong to or what anyone else thinks about it. If you doubt this, try to destroy an eagle's nest. Steal the carcass of a prey out of a hyena's jaws. Take some honey out of a bee's hive. Kick an anthill. See what those animals think about any of that.

No living being will let you simply destroy or steal what is theirs, because it *does* belong to them. It is their property because they are the ones who *worked* for it. Humans are not the only ones who believe what we earned is ours – every other living being thinks so too. They all instinctively *know* so.

As a second point, no one *cares* for that which is not theirs.

If you drive a car that was freely given to you and which may suddenly become someone else's tomorrow, you won't give a damn about dropping a lit cigarette butt on its seat, because *you* won't have to deal with it. If you live in a house you may be removed from at a moment's notice because, for some reason, you've been arbitrarily reassigned to live elsewhere, you won't bother fixing a faucet, installing a better shower, repainting the walls or unclogging the toilet.

Have you ever seen how Russians live? Half of their homes still have wallpapers from the 1920's. The other half doesn't simply because it has long peeled off. And after a whole century, no one

bothered replacing any of it because, since the Russian government can evict them at will (or at least could, until not very long ago), their apartments don't really belong to anyone.

Take a look inside buses, subway wagons and random walls across your city. How many aliases and obscenities have been written, drawn or sprayed on them? Look down at the streets. Are they littered with trash?

For us to care about something, it must be *ours*. To assign something its true value, we must have paid for it. To maintain it, we must be sure it won't be taken away from us. Otherwise, why bother?

If you ever want to see something slowly erode itself away, never to be cleaned, fixed or replaced, just make it public, communal.

Omnigender Absurdity:

This is a rather simple matter: we have men, women, and nothing else.

Sometimes, a person may be born with some neurological, genetic and/or hormonal problem that may give them mixed characteristics of both genders and/or cause them to feel sexual attraction for people of the same sex as them. I don't know the details, but it seems something along those lines happens. Thus, some men and women are homosexuals.

We, heterosexuals, didn't choose to be the way we are, and neither did those who are gay. They are people like us, just with different sexual preferences. And like everyone else, they are free to do whatever they want so long as they are not harming others. They are entitled to sleep with whoever they want, marry, ride a bike, do yoga, mow the lawn, buy a futon. I don't care, none of that is any of my business, and I have no right or reason to try to stop those people from living their lives as they see fit.

But that's it: we have men and women, heterosexuals and homosexuals - there's no other legitimate qualification. Transvestites or anything else that is a part of that ridiculous, gigantic and ever-growing acronym (LGBETC...) are just *depraved*. A man, gay or not, goes out at night dressed as a woman because he is demented and wants to antagonize others, not because he has a legitimate condition that compels him to do so. A bisexual

person has a sexual overdrive and a lack of self-control, which are neurological dysfunctions that lead them to pursue lewd activities over more constructive endeavors, and to do so throughout their entire lives which, in turn, tends to make them [relatively] useless for our species. I would give more examples, but I honestly cannot imagine what any of those other letters mean.

My point is: homosexuals have the same rights as anyone else. They are not to blame for their preferences and, by themselves, these don't harm anyone. But forcing elementary schools to build "genderless toilets" to make small children believe that dysfunctions, depravity and insanity are natural is absurd (they've gone this far in my country); to start creating new names, words and nouns to address unimaginably perverted people is ridiculous; and trying to force decent people to call depraved ones something with an "X" ("shex," "hix," or some lunacy of the sort) is completely unacceptable, because such things *do* harm others.

It seems to me that what those perverts want is for the rest of us to *guess* what each one of them was born with in between their legs, if they replaced it with something else or not, why, how they feel about men, women, plants, animals and whatever else they might fancy, how they like to dress at each time of the day, what inanimate objects they fantasize about, how many people and/or "toys" they like to have sex with at the same time, and then use a specific term out of semi-infinite imaginary ones to address or refer to them. Then, if we guess it wrong, we go to jail.

That's completely retarded.

In case you are gay, let me explain to you why heterosexuals don't like you very much: because homosexuality is *disgusting* (no offense - the truth just tends to be taken as an insult). It's not a matter of choice - a heterosexual brain just automatically interprets homosexual acts as repugnant. Seeing two men kissing each other, for us, is much like watching someone eating their own feces. Or a 95 years old lady having intercourse. Or pieces of someone's brain splattered over a wall.

Think about this: would *you* like to watch people eating feces on every movie, to read about it on every book, and to see it on every single commercial when you turn your TV on?

Shit-eaters are out there somewhere. They are also a minority, they are also entitled to the same rights as you are, and they also want to “come out of the toilet.” If people start encouraging them, they will fight for the “right” to sit right beside you in a restaurant and feast on their “meal” while you dine on yours. And then, a couple of years later, like gay people have been doing and just as not to lose political momentum, they’ll start trying to force you to eat theirs. Would you be okay with that?

We are not either.

I think I can speak for most people when I say this: we don’t *hate* homosexuals. We don’t want to deprive them from their fundamental rights. We don’t care about what they do in private. We just don’t want to hear about or see it because, to us, it’s repulsive.

And we don’t *have* to.

Also, it doesn’t matter how much homosexuals campaign, they’ll never stop being disgusting for heterosexuals because, once again, this is simply how the human brain works. Promoting their cause any further than what it has already been serves only to antagonize the rest of us – the vast majority of the human race, who follow the natural order of things.

Human Rights:

There’s no such thing as “something rights.” All rights [that actually exist] are natural, and they all apply to *any* living being. We just have a habit, culture and tradition of disrespecting every other species’.

There’s no such thing as “the right to work.” If you know how to do something that others need done, they’ll gladly pay you for your services. But if you don’t have any tradable skills, you are not entitled to be paid by anyone, because you have no use to them.

There’s no such thing as “the right to social protection.” You are only entitled to what you earned, to what you merited. Nothing else. No one is obligated to sustain you or pay for your incompetence (except your parents, since they are to blame for your existence, they may have propagated undesirable genes, and they most likely caused every crippling issue you have). No one

has to concern themselves about your mental health and well-being beyond not violating your natural rights.

There's no such thing as "the right to education, enjoyment of benefits of cultural freedom and scientific progress." No one has to teach you anything if they don't want to. Doing so requires effort (however little) and time, and you are not entitled to force anyone to help you against their will. You are free to express your culture, but you are not entitled to "enjoy the benefits" of anyone else's. If people want to share anything about their culture with you or not is entirely up to them – it says so right in the name: "their" culture; not "your." "Scientific progress" comes from a lot of work and investment, and whoever does that work and/or pays for it has the right to do whatever they please with its results. No one else gets a say in that (in principle, since this prerogative shouldn't be *abused*).

There's no such thing as "the right to health[care]." If you get sick, break an arm or grow a malign tumor, that's your problem. No one is obligated to give you medicine, set your bones back into place or surgically remove a cancer out of you. If you want any of that done, you have to pay for it.

There's a lot more, and in the declarations, covenants and treaties nations have signed to establish and enforce the so-called "human rights" they mixed legitimate ones (natural/fundamental rights) with completely unrelated things (politics, economic factors, racial and gender issues, etc.), creating a disturbing, nonsensical mess. They made the whole "human rights" thing as convoluted and flawed as they possibly could. So instead of doing the same, I'll do the exact opposite by reiterating:

There are no human rights.

Those are man-made fantasies based on the assumption that human life is worth more than any other, and that every person is entitled to everything regardless of their moral status, merits or contributions.

"Human rights" are indirect violations of our *actual* rights. And these are the only ones that must be respected and preserved, at all costs.

I'm done with the socialist agenda and, as you may have noticed, I hate socialists. I feel this way because of how they operate, because they never know why they defend what they defend, because the vast majority of them are just puppets, because they are comprised by the most useless among us, because they are all thieves, and because of everything they've actually done to my country and, by extension, to me. That means I'm biased. Despite my reasons, there is an emotional factor behind my words. So, to be fair, I'll try to assess the socialist ideology from a strictly logical perspective.

For starters, "social benefits," by what the expression technically means, are ideologically correct – they are policies and measures that seek the greater, collective good rather than the individual one. This is, in fact, how I defended we should think and act in Chapter I. But that's what they are *supposed* to do, and not what they *actually* do, thanks to how wrongly we have implemented them.

However desirable it is for us to consider our whole society rather than exclusively our individual selves in our actions, doing anything for others is a *choice*. This cannot be imposed on anyone, because doing so is a violation of our natural freedoms. This is the first thing we've been doing wrong: we have legally forced people to do things against their will, in favor of others. This generates hatred towards those other people, which in turn makes us want to help them even *less*, thus having the exact opposite effect of the desired one.

We've also been wrong in helping anyone who *wants* help, regardless of whether they really need or deserve it. We shouldn't house, feed and protect criminals, and yet we do so, at decent people's expense. We shouldn't provide social assistance to those who had every opportunity to make something out of themselves but *refused* to, and yet we do so, at decent people's expense. We shouldn't welcome refugees who destroyed their own countries into ours, and yet we do so, at decent people's expense. We shouldn't hire incompetent people for a job position based on their skin color, sexual orientation, or because they are handicapped, and yet we do so, at decent people's expense.

There's no point in helping someone when doing so causes as much harm, or even more, to others. It's downright idiotic to do so when the person being helped doesn't deserve it and the one being harmed is innocent. This is destructive behavior.

Still, there are people who both need and deserve help, and thus should, indeed, be helped. We have veterans of war, police officers

and firefighters who may have gotten severely injured or maimed when doing their jobs; people who ended up being incapacitated when doing something they had to or when they were helping others; people who were maimed after being the victim of a crime, and people who were unluckily born with a crippling condition. I assume most of us would agree such people ought to be helped. And since we have, individually, no means to do so – we don't know what really happened to them, who they are, where they live, and we don't have their bank account numbers – it makes sense for the state to do so in our stead, taking a small part of what we all pay in taxes to aid those folks. Helping people who *through no fault of their own* need it, or who were simply *unluckier* than the rest of us, is fair. It's the right thing to do, because any one of us could randomly be in their place. This is the only case in which people ought to be “forced” to contribute with others, because it is indeed fair and thus, supposedly, done willingly.

One more trick can be pulled out of the socialist hat while we don't manage to offer everyone similar opportunities, properly regulate how much people are paid, how products are priced, and reward everyone fairly for their competences and efforts. This time, a trick that doesn't take from all to help a few, but takes from a few to help all. But this is something I've already mentioned: I'm talking about taking what corrupt people, criminals, and greedy, overpaid folks who own far too much have and use it for the collective good. There are two points here: one is that those people didn't *earn* what they have, and the other is that they have far more than they could possibly ever *need*. Thus, they shouldn't have what they do and what they have is being wasted. And morally speaking, stealing from thieves is not theft.

That's it. Those are the only two cases – “the invalids” and “the cheaters” – in which I believe “social intervention” is valid. And since in the first case intervention consists in giving to some people, while in the second it relies on taking from others, a very simple and obvious solution materializes: we could take from “the cheaters” and directly give it to “the invalids.” That would be fair, easily understandable, hardly anyone would be against it, and the other 99% of the population would be unaffected.

To sum everything up: social benefits should be reduced to a minimum; only qualified immigrants and refugees should be welcomed into another country; no one should have more rights than

anyone else; human rights don't exist; gay people should be respected, but not depraved ones; everyone should be paid what their work is actually worth, independently of income gaps; and we're all entitled to own and keep what we earned.

The problem is not the socialist ideology, but the socialists themselves. It's not the idea, but the flawed people pursuing it. It's not what it theoretically seeks, but what it has achieved in practice. Done right, social policies have a positive effect: they mitigate suffering and may allow people who otherwise couldn't to become useful, productive, and perhaps even happy. Done wrongly they are a catastrophe, because aiding those who do not deserve it is not "aiding" but "*abetting*."

As always, this is all a simple matter of being fair – this is where we never tire of failing. Having no realistic sense of justice, we are not prepared for socialism.

It could be that socialists believe that implementing their policies will *make* us better. But it won't. Reality goes the other way around: we must become better first, before it can work. And, ironically, it is *capitalism* that might be able to pave our way there, since it encourages individualism and, consequently, one's pursuit of bettering oneself. In a capitalist environment, people must try to become the best they can, to come up with new ideas and succeed where no one has before, so as to reap greater profits. And when someone pulls it off, they can keep all earnings and accolades for themselves, being well rewarded (albeit potentially unfairly, beyond what they deserve).

Socialism, on the other hand, encourages collectivism and the reliance on others. In a socialist environment, people don't have to learn, try, or effectively do anything. They have no incentive to improve themselves, because they can let *others* do all the work and still reap the same benefits, without making any effort. If someone tries and succeeds at doing something, what they should gain from it is instead shared with those who did nothing.

Capitalism makes people morally worse, but intellectually better. Socialism *believes* it makes people morally better but it doesn't, and it also makes them intellectually worse. Neither one really works while we, as a species, are who we are. But if a day ever comes when we've finally grown better, some form of socialism might work better than plain capitalism. For that day to arrive we must reeducate ourselves though, and this necessary reeducation (becoming less

greedy) goes against capitalist principles. So... we are basically trapped.

As it pertains to politics, I believe the way for us to move forward consists, for the time being, in sticking to capitalism, abandoning all of our current social policies, and adopting the suggestions I've made in this topic and the previous one (plus others I haven't thought of but which likely exist and follow the same reasonable principles).

Economy(cs)

The economy is one of the bases of a functional society, it directly affects all of our lives, and I'd like to mention a couple of things about it that I believe should interest those who, like me, are not experts in the subject.

Before anything else, I should note that there's one thing called "the economy" - which is the actual system of production and distribution of goods - and another thing called "economics," which is the social science that studies how human madness interferes with the first one. And both things are so intertwined that I'm just going to use the term "economy" to address the two of them at once, as if there was no distinction, because doing otherwise would generate nothing but confusion. May the economists forgive me.

Since, the way I see it, our economy is inextricably tied to human irrational behavior, in practice and in a free market how much a person's work is worth is not an absolute value but a subjective, oscillating one that is based on how much other people are willing to pay them for doing it. If, for instance, someone bakes *the* best bread on the planet but for some reason no one other than themselves likes or knows about it, they'll spend their whole life eating their own bread and drinking rain water, because they won't be able to exchange their product for money.

The fact that our economy is based on varying tastes, volatile moods and uninformed decisions, while also being constantly disturbed by marketing strategies and publicity stunts, leads to the misvaluation of people's work. What creates some of the problems I mentioned in the previous topic is the fact that even if we want to be fair we *can't*,

because we are often led, by ourselves and others, to believe products and services are worth anything *other* than what they actually are.

This is a hard problem to solve because it emerges naturally. So long as people are free to decide how much of their money they want to spend on what – as we are and should be – this will likely remain an ill-resolved issue. I think the best we can do, for now, is to try to *balance* things a little better via non-disruptive regulations and transparency, adopting measures such as the ones I suggested when I talked about capitalism.

If we don't take active measures to make the market fairer, it will never be so.

Inflation is another interesting aspect of the economy. Do you know why every currency on the planet constantly loses value? Why the opposite hardly ever happens? Why the prices of goods keep rising, making you poorer and poorer as time goes by if you don't do anything about it?

Prices do not inflate just because demand, every now and then, surpasses supply. They mostly do so because governments deliberately adopt measures to devalue their own currencies. And even though that sounds self-destructive, it's done for a good reason.

With a positive inflation, people *consume*, because their money is losing value as time passes. What they can get for a dollar today will cost them two tomorrow, so they buy it now. People spend what they have, they need to work to get paid more, and companies keep producing because their stocks are sold.

With negative inflation, or “deflation,” the opposite happens: people *don't* consume. Why would you buy something for two dollars today if it's going to cost you one tomorrow? If a currency is rising in value, people *save* money. Stocks fill up and prices drop, because no one buys anything. With full stocks, companies can't produce more, so they start firing their employees. People who lose their jobs will consume even less, forcing prices further down, making everyone wait even longer to go shopping, leading to even more people getting fired. Very quickly, the whole system breaks down.

Inflation sucks, but it keeps the wheel spinning. Deflation stops it dead. This one initially seems like a good thing but, in reality, it's far worse.

In matters of economy, if we don't take human mentality and behavior into account the production and exchange of goods and services die. And if the economic activity dies, everything else goes along with it. *One* [big enough] macro-economic mistake can lead to entire populations rioting within weeks.

Those in charge adopt some measures that seem wrong, such as devaluing currencies or manipulating interest rates, just to keep the world moving. Those are actually the right things to do, at least until we figure out some less arbitrary and flimsy means to keep our fragile economy running.

As a layman, there's only one more thing I want to mention about human economy, which I believe is the most important aspect of it: *employment and unemployment rates*.

Trying to keep everyone, or even just the majority of people, employed at all times is simply not possible. That's unnatural and unsustainable, because *we don't need the work of eight billion people*.

Let's say that, with our current technology, a single farmer can feed a thousand human beings. That leaves us with one worker and nine hundred and ninety nine people we now must *find a use* for. Since their survival is already guaranteed, there's nothing strictly necessary left for those people to do. So we set them on tasks of secondary, non-vital importance – we put some of those left to mine ore, extract oil, chop wood and collect other raw materials. Others will take those and turn them into finished products that will make our lives safer, less unpleasant, more comfortable. A fourth group of people will dedicate themselves to discovering new things and improving old ones, while a fifth will keep trying to amuse us all, so that whatever free time we have left in our hands goes by more easily before we finally die. So far, everything is fine: we are fed *and* comfortable, while actively working to make things better. But the math doesn't add up.

After all useful activities have been fulfilled, we are left with six hundred and fifty idlers, because the work of three hundred and fifty people is enough to satisfy all of their *own* needs and wants. And yet

we must find something to keep those unoccupied people busy, otherwise they won't be able to afford buying anything and will resort to stealing and destroying what the others have. What do we do, then, with those six hundred and fifty deadweights?

There's nothing left to do with them – they exist only to consume resources needed/generated by the useful three hundred and fifty.

The “solution” we have been adopting is to *create problems* for everyone, so that we can put those unneeded people to solve them. As an example, we enlarge our armed forces, increasing our own safety while hoping that, in the best case scenario, those who join them will end up dying and stop causing us problems and costing us resources. But doing so actually *decreases* our safety, because enlarging our armed forces automatically turns us into a threat to other nations, forcing these to grow their own armies as well, ultimately increasing our odds of being attacked since we were the ones who *started* the arms race that led to everyone ruining their own economies (since, once again, military personnel cost a lot of money and don't produce anything or provide any useful service).

Another thing mismanaged countries do is to create *new public offices*, and the job of the people hired to occupy them becomes to *hinder* the progress of “the useful ones.” The logic behind this scheme seems valid in principle: it's better to have idlers slowing down progress than to have them halting it altogether and/or ruining everything that the necessary/useful people have achieved so far, because this *is* what they would do if they faced starvation or were otherwise simply left unoccupied. People go around stealing what others have when they have no opportunity to acquire such things by themselves, and they become alcoholics, obese and/or addicts when there isn't anything better than booze, food and drugs to keep them constantly distracted. But the present “solution” involves obstructing, delaying, and potentially halting the progress of the “useful ones,” holding these ones back, hindering our entire species.

Another common “solution” is to produce, as an example, more cars and *not* to automate their production lines. Governments subsidize large factories on the condition that they don't utilize modern technology in their lines, being forced to unnecessarily employ thousands of people for no legitimate reason. The company saves a lot of money in taxes (which the rest of us has to pay in their stead), the government swipes part of the unemployment rate under the rug (which translates into votes), and the subsidized company produces worse products that cost thrice more in five times the span that

would be required to produce better ones if its production lines were automated. As a consequence, a lot of natural, non-renewable resources are wasted to inject more vehicles that no one needs or wants into the market. Then we need more roads to accommodate them all, more restrictive rules to avoid traffic accidents, and to discover and adopt new means to clean up the environmental damage they cause. Consumers are manipulated into buying those vehicles by marketing and publicity, more people die in car crashes, global warmth causes us further problems, and we all waste some extra 5% of our entire lives stuck in traffic. The car manufacturer gets even richer without providing an actual service, since more cars weren't needed; the government gets a spike in popularity, by artificially creating unnecessary jobs; and all of our lives get considerably worse.

Yet another widely-adopted tactic is to legally obligate people to *hire professionals* such as lawyers, doctors and accountants, yet again without need.

Hiring lawyers is not strictly necessary because virtually any person can understand their fundamental rights and argue their defense or accusation before a judge using simple reasoning and common sense. Nowadays, hardly anyone ever needs to consult a doctor to know what ails them, what medical exams they need to have to be sure, and what drugs they need to take to cure themselves - we can figure that all out on our own, for free and in just a few minutes, by using the internet. And in the vast majority of cases, people don't need to hire an accountant to fill out their tax form or their business'. Doing so may take some work, but it's usually not nearly as complicated as it would have to be to justify paying someone else to do it in our stead.

Nonetheless, we are legally forced to hire all those professionals. We are not allowed to appear before a judge without a lawyer representing us; we are not allowed to do laboratory tests or buy pharmaceutical drugs without a doctor's prescription; and at least where I live, we are not allowed to start a business without hiring an accountant beforehand and monthly paying them for as long as the company is active (starting before it even is).

Eventually, we may need the help of a lawyer or an accountant. In others, such as during surgeries, we'll definitely need the assistance and expertise of a doctor. But most of the time, we don't. And if we were allowed to solve our own problems the easiest way, most of those professionals would be left unemployed. Thus, our freedoms

are officially and drastically curtailed, we are forced to spend a lot of money, all our lives are made harder and our times wasted just so that more idlers – even if qualified ones – can be kept busy.

To make things worse, when we are obligated to hire external aid those who provide it are free to charge as much as they want for their unnecessary services. I've never seen a lawyer or doctor who didn't *extort* a cornered client or patient. And we've all been cornered by our incompetent governments' laws and policies.

We haven't been working to *solve* the "unemployment issue," because the actual problem is having far too many people around. Unemployment is just one of the many tragic consequences of that, and we've been barely managing to keep it at bay, unsustainably and by unleashing all kinds of havoc along with our palliative workarounds.

The right, logical and easier thing to do is to get rid of excess people. Their existence is not positive or even neutral, but it actually has a *negative* value in "the game of life." Useful people themselves must work thrice as hard and pay in pain and blood for the unnecessary ones to live, just so that these can *suffer along*.

And how do we handle those who are neither needed nor wanted?

As I have already previously suggested when I talked about homogenizing our species: via mass sterilization or anti-breeding policies. This is a different problem solved by the same solution – two birds, one stone. And if we add Earth's limited resources to the equation, we hit *three* birds at once. If we take global warming into account, *four*! Traffic? *Five*! Internet bandwidth usage? *Six*! Growing energy demand? *Seven*! Congested mobile phone networks? *Eight*! And there's probably a million more items that could fit in this list.

We are the problem, and the solution is to reduce our numbers. The more people we eliminate, the better everything will be for those who remain. Any other "solution" is long-term suicide.

Demo(n)cracy

"We must defend democracy at all costs!" [Western] politicians, these days, say as often as they possibly can. I say we should kill it,

dismember its corpse, set it on fire, then throw democracy's ashes into a volcano, drop a nuclear bomb into it, and cover the remaining crater with 50 meters of reinforced concrete just to be sure.

Churchill once said (while quoting someone else himself), "Democracy is the worst form of Government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time." I disagree with the second part, but you can at least take his word for the first if you won't take mine.

At first sight, democracy makes sense. It even has a certain elegance to it: billions of people arguing will never reach a consensus, so we elect a much lower number of representatives instead, each speaking for hundreds of thousands or millions of us, and charge them with debating the major issues of our societies and deciding our collective fate. After all points of view have been expressed and thoroughly considered, a vote is called and the will of the majority wins, settling the matter to the benefit of as many people as possible. In theory, everyone is heard, it's fair, the best solution is found and it works. In practice, it's a catastrophe.

Democracy's flagship and poster-boy is "listening to the people," but that's also its worst mistake, because doing so consists in letting every citizen, regardless of how immoral, manipulable, uneducated, incompetent, stupid and poorly informed they are interfere with all of our lives - and most of us are all of those things at once. Most people don't know themselves, what they really want or what's best for them, so they should never be allowed to meddle in decisions that affect others. *Ever*.

When the average human being is allowed to vote, we end up with experts in swaying and swindling in charge. We end up with those who are the most power-hungry and who least care about other people's well-being deciding all of our futures. And the outcome of that can't *possibly* be good.

As a second point, democracy prides itself of being fair since, in theory, everyone is heard. But we all know that doesn't happen.

In a true democracy, anyone should be allowed to vote, without *any* criteria. Babies, convicts, the insane, and even pets, as they also live among us and directly suffer the consequences of our bad decisions, should all cast their ballots. Their opinions should be considered as valuable as yours or mine.

We don't allow those beings to vote because we are not retarded. But we allow those who are just as bad (teenagers, senile people, the illiterate, etc.) to because we *are*, actually, retarded. It doesn't make sense – our democracy is wrong from any perspective. It's neither fair nor functional, neither moral nor logical.

Democracy also *encourages corruption*, since one needs money and (al)lies to get elected.

Running for office, a candidate needs to buy votes. They need to hire aides and print pamphlets, to bribe the media and advertise in it. They need “trolls” to spread positive fake news about them and negative ones about their competitors, they need to wire-tap the Democrat Committee's office, and they need to pay Facebooks and Cambridge Analytics to [not so] subtly sway undecided voters in their favor. And a candidate must be able to *afford* doing all of that, otherwise they are bound to lose to any other who can.

And where does that money come from?

It may come from donors who truly believe in a candidate's goals, ideology and ethics. But to get such donations, a man running for office needs to fool a lot of people, since no matter what he defends millions will always disagree with him. As I said earlier, people in general don't know themselves, what they want, what they need, or what's best for them; thus, most of us can't tell whether a candidate's proposals and promises are laudable or laughable, and we couldn't understand why even if someone who does bothered trying to explain it to us.

To acquire enough money to finance one's campaign, a candidate needs the support of different groups, many of them antagonistic and all concerned exclusively with their own particular interests. To convince disagreeing people, a candidate needs to *lie* – they need to promise something to one group of people and the opposite to another. If a candidate manages to simply *omit* things instead of making them up, they are considered “a good politician.”

The money required for campaigning may also come from private companies. All a candidate needs is to promise to do whatever those companies tell them to once they've been elected. It's the classic “deal with the devil,” which tends to be as bad as it sounds – one politician seals the deal and millions of people pay for it in their stead, with blood and tears.

A candidate may also be financed by a public fund created specifically to this end. One's political party may be granted public money according to its representation in Congress, with more chairs yielding bigger shares. In this case, the system itself has already been corrupted, because those who are in power will tend to remain there forever. (And though this scheme must surely have sounded insane to you, we *do* have it in place in my country).

Once finally in office, to have any of their proposals approved and enacted into law a politician needs to buy his peers. Congressmen on sale are easy to find, but they are expensive. Now that our candidate has been elected, though, at least they are able to pay their co-workers with money stolen from all of us instead of having to spend his own or just a few other people's.

Another problem with democracy is that, as someone once said (there's no consensus on who), "Democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what to have for lunch."

That means minorities (the lamb) always get devoured in a democratic system because, ideally, they are supposed to. This *is* how a democracy is meant to work, since it is a system based upon and built to honor the will of the majority.

It's paradoxical that people who defend democracy also ardently defend the rights of minorities these days (a clear indication that our leaders have no idea of what they are doing). We cannot have both, because they are antagonistic. Whenever the will of a minority and the will of the majority diverge, honoring that of the first one is, by definition, *anti*-democratic.

More important, though, is the fact that the best among us are *always* a minority - "the best" *means* "the most capable X% of the population" (where "X" is any number below 10. The lower the better). To manage to get elected in a democracy, any member of this particular group would have to *corrupt* themselves first which, in turn, would disqualify them as "one of the best." And while the best of us refuse to sink down to the level of our common politicians, these ones - the wrong people elected by wrong voters - keep making the choices, which means the ideal solution to any of our problems will never be found and the best decisions will never be made other than, perhaps, once in a long while and by sheer accident.

Imagine if the average human IQ was 150 instead of 82 (no, it's not 100). Initially, it sounds like that should fix the problem, allowing democracy to actually work. And maybe it could. But that would still not be *ideal* because, with such a population, the best among us would have IQs of 300 or so. And then these people would be the only ones who should be allowed to call the shots – still a tiny minority, as the best of us will always be.

Thus, another reason why a democracy can't possibly work is because, by ignoring all minorities (or listening exclusively to the loudest ones), it *doesn't allow* for those who should be in power to ever get there.

Now, answer this question: considering that, in a democracy, you can only vote for people you know *very little* about, who would you choose to occupy the position of chief of the Executive?

A seamstress? A pimp? A smuggler? An actor? A comedian? A priest? An engineer? A philosopher? A lawyer? An economist? A general? A diplomat?

Those six last options are, in principle, valid. An engineer is supposedly smart, and they know how to build things. A philosopher can think by himself and tends to take everything into account. A lawyer understands the importance of the law, why it must be carefully phrased and omnipresently enforced. An economist knows better how to manage a country and the wealth that guides all human decisions. A general understands about logistics, he knows how to lead and how to protect a nation against foreign enemies. A diplomat knows how to negotiate instead of threat, how to compromise instead of impose, and how to talk his way out of a conflict, sparing lives and assets from being destroyed. But, ideally, to rule one should have *all* of those capabilities, and none of those experts understands a thing about the others' areas of expertise.

The point is: there's *no one qualified* to run a nation in a democracy, because no one is intentionally prepared for it.

If it were an option, we should vote for someone righteous and smart who was raised and groomed to ponder, rule, manage, lead, think strategically and argue, all at once. But if we even managed to find someone who fits that bill in a democratic country, who among us would actually vote for a "non-expert," a "jack-of-all-trades" or a "president wannabe?"

If the ideal candidate existed and stood right before us, he'd still be democratically outvoted.

Due to always disfavoring part of the population, a democracy also *generates conflict*.

We could have adopted an ideology that seeks the benefit of all, but instead we chose one that is based on benefiting most and ignoring the rest. If only a part – even if the majority – of the population is taken into account when decisions that affect *everyone* are made, the rest of it is harmed and becomes unhappy. As this keeps happening over and over again, and to the same people, these are bound and entitled to eventually revolt, potentially resorting to violence, because if unsatisfied people don't react violently, they remain ignored, which means they'll continue to be abused forever.

Thanks to sheer numbers, minorities can't beat majorities. This is the very fact that holds a democracy together. The democratic ideology doesn't survive because it is ideal (which it isn't), because it works (which it doesn't), because it's better than other forms of government (which it isn't either) or because people are happy with it (which many aren't), but simply because people *fear* (as always) being outnumbered. Democracies survive exclusively due to those who are harmed by it being afraid to say so and even more of trying to *do* anything about it, because the way a [Western] democracy deals with any kind of dissidents nowadays is to denominate them a terrorist organization, so that it can legally treat them as if they were the worst possible kind of criminals.

Managing any population is, perhaps above anything else, a matter of balancing how much abuse minorities suffer, for how long they can endure it, and how afraid they are of the majority and its government.

When people are constantly abused and afraid, they start hating. This hate only grows with time and, at some point, it blows up. Depending directly on the duration and cruelty of the abuses suffered, as well as on the amount of fear a minority has of the majority and its government, that "blowing up" may materialize as protests, as violent protests, as clashes with the police, as clashes with the police in which this one loses, as sacking, arson or sabotage, as an armed riot, a coup d'état or civil war. And the more violent and disruptive the means adopted, the more likely they are to lead to

those who are to blame for the rebels' suffering being ousted. But the only thing that's actually guaranteed is that many *innocents* will be harmed in the process.

If successful, revolts may lead to reforms, to a change in government or in governing structures, to laws being revoked or enacted, to independence being declared. We have many historical examples of such attempts taking place – the Sumerian Revolt, the Antiachaeameneid Revolts, the Athenian Revolution (leading to the first implementation of democracy on Earth which, of course, didn't work), many revolts against the Roman Republic and Empire, several rebellions in China, the American War of Independence, and hundreds of other such occurrences. Yet *most* insurgences lead not to change, but instead to those revolting being slaughtered¹³ – which is the logical, nearly-inevitable outcome when anyone tries to fight those who are better armed than them.

Where a democracy succeeds is at balancing those three factors I mentioned (how much abuse minorities suffer, for how long they can endure it, and how afraid they are of the majority) *better* than other forms of government. It manages, for instance, to downgrade armed rebellions to mere, brief protests (so long as a government manages to keep the police and armed forces under control). I dare say this might be the very reason why democracy has by now been so widely adopted. This could possibly even be the core practical point *around* which the democratic ideology was conceived.

Barely succeeding at keeping unsatisfied people at bay is a democracy's one and only merit. But those people wouldn't be *so* unhappy if not due to democracy's own flaws, as by not being forced to abide by the ignorant majority's whims, a non-democratic government can treat minorities much more fairly.

Yet another of democracy's faults is that, although measures and policies exist that could benefit us all, people elected for office strive to defend *exclusively* the rights of the group(s) they represent.

As an example, the military portion of the population gets to elect a certain number of representatives, and then, once in office, those do everything they can to advance the military cause. That's only natural, since they were elected precisely to do that. But it also means they ignore the needs and pleas of everyone else.

¹³ **Source:** https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_revolutions_and_rebellions (Accessed in September, 2024).

Democratically-elected representatives are encouraged to only see and take into account a small part of the big picture, ignoring our species' collective interests for the sole sake of those who voted for them. If they do otherwise, their stint in an overpaid public job with infinite benefits won't last long, and their families won't have enough time to travel the entire world at the taxpayer's expense.

To protect their own personal interests, elected representatives always seek an *unfair* outcome, because that's exactly what those who elected them want. And seeking *advantages* to any particular individual or group of people is essentially what causes all the problems we have as a society.

Democratic *mandate spans* are also a major issue.

For a single human being to turn out well, decades are planned for in advance. [Reasonable] parents plan their pregnancy beforehand and prepare carefully for it. After the child is born, this one is forced to spend more than two decades learning before going out into the world to actually do something. When either of those things (among many others) *doesn't* happen, the child in question grows up to become an average, mediocre, normal adult. Likewise, for our whole society and species to develop properly, we must plan for the next *centuries or thousands of years*.

No person or group of people is in a position to do such long-term planning except for a government. Though that's technically not part of a state's fundamental attributions, it should be. And in a democracy, what happens is the exact opposite of that - in it, the *shortest* span of the future is taken into account.

Elected representatives only care about what happens between one election and the next. What happens after those four or so years only matters to them if they get re-elected, because any problems they created will otherwise fall into someone else's lap, and anything they started building will either be destroyed or taken credit for by another politician as well.

Being in office, to assume one will be re-elected is unwise, since even if they honestly did the best they could for their country, and even if what they did was in fact the best *anyone* could possibly do for it, the vast majority of the electorate is going to be completely oblivious to this fact. And that competent candidate's opponents can always sway voters away from him using dishonest and despicable means anyway.

To make things worse, given how being re-elected is any in-office person's *top* priority, and considering all that gathering votes entails, out of the few years a democratic representative's mandate is comprised of one of them is *entirely wasted* on campaigning. And while entertaining potential voters, those in office do whatever they have to to raise their popularity – a nation's interests are, for a fourth of an entire democratic cycle, thrown out the window.

In a democracy, during twenty-five percent of the time whatever pulls in the most votes gets done instead of what *needs* to be.

As a final argument: when you are in a group and you don't know how to work your way out of a certain situation, what do you do?

You collect everyone's opinion and vote on a solution. You gather a few "from-the-top-of-my-mind" options and choose one of them based on the opinions of people who, like you, have no idea of what they are doing, and who also don't care about the outcome. They should at least care about the consequences, but they don't. Why?

Because *no one is held accountable for a democratic decision*.

If the worst possible choice is made and everything goes to shit, it's nobody's fault – each voter will blame the poor outcome on the others, and none of them will pay for their collective mistake. Every person affected by that decision will have to endure its consequences, but no one will be singled out and *fairly punished* for it.

The democratic mentality is, "Let the majority decide." And what each member of the majority thinks is, "Let the others decide." When we have no idea of what we are doing, we think that. And when we *do* know what we are doing, we still think that anyway, because everyone else's vote counts as a single one – the exact same as ours does and, individually, just as irrelevant. Why would we waste our time researching and studying, trying to find out a proper course of action, to identify the best candidate or to convey a solution we may have found to others, if our troubles will be ignored and go completely unrewarded?

A democratic system is one in which nobody gives a damn because no one is blamed for a mistake, everyone comes out individually unpunished for contributing to it, and no one is properly rewarded if something ever accidentally works. In a democracy, we can harm

hundreds of millions of people at once while paying the price of harming just a single one (by individually suffering, ourselves, the consequences of our ill-considered collective decisions).

Taking advantage of our natural laziness and irresponsibility, democracy not only fails in finding the best solutions but it also tends to lead to some of the worst possible ones.

Logically, we each vote to defend what we believe in (or were *led* to, more often than not), and we hardly ever agree with one another. Having a whole Congress filled with representatives who are there to defend diverging interests leads only to instability, as opposite measures keep getting adopted and, in the end, nothing moves towards any discernible goal. If we have a clown for a president and/or a whole circus in Congress, nothing works for anyone. And we always end up getting at least one of the two in a democracy.

We need those in power to be aligned with reason, to work towards improving *everyone's* well-being and not just that of those who financed their campaigns or who share a profession, gender, or skin color with them. To fully understand a problem, to see how it connects with everything else, to accurately anticipate the consequences of our choices and make the right decisions, we need people who can *think* - we need people who are willing to listen to the arguments of others, who can understand them, who are open to having their minds changed, who are not too proud to admit their mistakes, and who are capable of learning and correcting themselves.

We need more than mediocre people setting the example, and we need more than average human minds leading the way if we are to one day get to where we want to be. And to get such people in power we need to have *only* the same kind of people voting. No one else.

"Ironically" (as it might actually be by design), by having a democracy in place we cannot elect those ideal people or allow them alone to vote, because those who are currently making the rules don't want that to happen and never will since they, themselves, do not qualify as such (thus, if the system were corrected, they'd lose all the power they lust so much for).

Democracy is a dead end, because it cannot fix itself. Once it's in place, it must be destroyed and all those in power must be completely stripped from it so that a better ideology and governing

system can replace the democratic ones. And one such system would be, as I have been suggesting, an *intellectual aristocracy* (which is similar to but better than a technocracy).

Monarchy

*Of forms of government tried in the past,
Monarchy is one of the best.
No, I do not jest.*

Sorry. It just naturally rhymed.

Although not my first choice, a monarchy is also much better than a democracy. For starters, the monarchic system is simpler than other forms of government, and unnecessary complexity translates into inefficiency. It translates into decisions taking months instead of minutes to be made, and into something that could be free costing a fortune. And those delays and costs can often be the difference between success and failure, between life and death.

When decisions affect millions or billions of people, when they can potentially lead to poverty, war, famine, to spreading pandemics or a nuclear holocaust, when unforeseen crises randomly arise and the very existence of our species may depend on how swiftly they are dealt with, efficiency is *vital*. The more people there are involved in a decision-making process the longer they take to decide, and when a course of action is finally agreed upon it might be too late. Even if it's not, it's always late enough for at least *some* damage that could have been avoided to have already been caused.

For a nation to develop properly, it needs *cohesion* as well. It needs clear objectives and people working together towards achieving them. If, for instance, we have half the parliament defending the Brexit, the other half against it, and the prime minister somewhere in the middle, we get... well, we get the Brexit – a [democratic] mess no one was happy with, with negative repercussions echoing years after the deal was signed, above all for the British people themselves.

Imagine for a moment that you are in charge of your country. You are its all-powerful, absolutist monarch. Assuming you honestly want to make things better for everyone, what would you do?

The answer itself is irrelevant. We can all come up with our own and, whatever yours is, it would not be possible with a large, random number of congressmen voting against many, most, or all of your projects. Something you could have decided in minutes and have implemented in three months would instead take three whole years to be negotiated in Congress, and then one more for 25% of it to be implemented while the remaining 75% would have been turned into something that goes directly *against* your initial intentions. The whole thing could ultimately end up having the opposite effect to the one intended.

In my country, we have about twenty different political parties. Maybe thirty, maybe more (new ones come and go all the time, so it's hard to say). If we take the United States though, where there are only two of them, it should be possible to get the government aligned and moving. But what the Republicans do when they have the power will be undone the next time the Democrats get to rule, and vice versa. It's a country-sized tug-of-war – if no side definitively wins, no one gets anywhere; and if tensions ever rise too high, the rope might snap.

The funny thing about the US is that, by having only one right-wing and one left-wing parties available, they don't even have the *option* to aim for the center, which is the ideal position to be targeted on the political spectrum. Since American people can only vote on one of two opposite extremes, getting things right is not even possible for the world's greatest superpower. And voting on one of two diametrically opposed parties also automatically *implies* that the American voter wants extreme measures to be adopted (which is hardly ever true, in the US or anywhere else), leading their politicians to promote and enact more radical policies than anyone actually desires.

Doing what needs to be done in a system with a *separation of powers* is also more difficult.

When young, I believed anyone could be convinced of the truth if presented with facts and given proper, clear and strictly reasonable arguments. In time, I learned that's not true at all (this being one of

the many reasons why I dropped off of law school, a little over six months away from graduation). Even when we are right, most people don't bother listening. If they listen, they usually can't understand what we are saying. If they understand, they pretend they didn't whenever this is easier or otherwise more convenient to them. If they don't pretend, they refuse to admit we are right anyway, out of pride or spite. If we manage to make our point perfectly clear, leaving them no way out other than to acknowledge they were wrong, they resort to personally insulting and attempting to discredit us. And if this doesn't shut us up, they assault us physically (and/or throw us in jail, depending on whom we are arguing with).

If you find yourself in a position in which you can propose new laws or enact decrees, many representatives will do everything they can to veto them, be it because they honestly disagree with your ideas, because their party ordered them to, because your projects go against the private interests that financed their own campaigns, to save face after standing against you on a different issue, or simply to antagonize you. If by some miracle your good intentions get approved without being entirely disfigured, judges and, ultimately, the Supreme Court can simply decide to ignore them (constitutionally or not).

Since arguing doesn't work and convincing others is not an option, the only way to impose one's will upon everyone else is to have *absolute* power – even when that will is indeed reasonable, fair and beneficial for all.

For things to work cohesively while most of us can neither see reason nor admit it when we are wrong – making arguing a futile endeavor, and reality and the truth often mere details – we may be better off with a single person in charge: a monarch. Or a dictator (same thing, minus a crown).

In the past, great kings have given birth to golden ages, just as despots have given rise to dark ones. Concentrated power is a gamble, and a very risky one. But in a monarchy, *the odds can be favorably bent*.

When power is *inherited*, no random person, personal friend of the previous ruler or member of their political party will be the next one to lead the nation. Instead, it will be one of their children – someone who was born and raised within royalty, who was properly fed,

taught and trained, who studied in the best schools and lived their entire life in direct contact with the most enlightened experts in the realm, learning the dynamics of politics, management, economy, diplomacy and war straight from the source. The next person in charge will be someone who spent their entire life preparing to manage their country and lead their people (assuming a competent first king in place). And if the first-born heir doesn't want to take the reins of power, or for some reason they turn out not to be up to the task, siblings often abound to don the crown in their stead, with varying talents and aptitudes (yet always far above the average).

That at least solves the democratic problem of not having a single person *apt* to manage and lead a country.

A monarchy also handles the *span issue* of ruling much better than a democracy does.

While democratic representatives act for and thus only care about very limited mandates, in an autocracy he-who-has-the-power retains it for decades. Beyond that, whereas in a non-monarchical tyranny whoever is the most feared takes up the reins of power after the ruler dies, in a monarchy it is, once again, inherited by the king's own progeny – and most people would rather have their dynasty be as successful, respected and celebrated as possible. Thus, the monarch is the only kind of leader who has *personal reasons* to consider the far future, as he ought to care not only about his [extended] ruling but also about the ruling of his descendants. And this coincides with any nation's, as well as humanity's, best interests.

The problem with a monarchy is that if the wrong person squats on the throne everything goes to hell, since absolute power is free to wreak all kinds of havoc and a bad person's children are bound to be poorly raised, thus being likely to perpetuate their parent's misdeeds or even “improve” (negatively) upon them. But, in such cases, we could always reinstate the timeless tradition of kingslaying.

At the very least it's much easier to accurately assign blame and seek justice when there's only one person in charge – which solves the “irresponsibility and impunity” issue of a democracy.

Artificial Dictatorship

We have come to a point where AIs need to be taken into account even when discussing politics. I'll be brief because, as this Pandora's Box is currently being opened, I'm as ignorant as anyone else as to how dire the curses it will unleash upon us will be.

The unpredictability of our current "rise of the AI" scenario brings to mind one episode of *The Big Bang Theory* in which Sheldon, Leonard and Penny decide to instate "Anything Can Happen Thursdays" – one day a week when they'll randomly choose what to eat for dinner, not knowing what it's going to be. It's followed by "It Won't Stop Coming Out Friday."

AIs will make the human being even stupider, as the vast majority of us won't have to work anymore and thus won't bother *learning* anything. Soon, almost none of us will use our brains, and these will quickly deteriorate while intelligent algorithms do everything we once used to in our stead. We are likely going to become obese imbeciles who spend all day watching procedurally-generated pornography and AI-written movies on paper-thin screens. We might even lose the ability to communicate with each other. Or not. Nobody knows.

But that we'll become much stupider seems like a sure bet. And as this happens, democracy will grow even more problematic. There will come a point when we will *have* to delegate control over the human society to AIs, because we will no longer be able to handle it ourselves (as if we ever were) and human decision-making will keep leading us to ever worsening scenarios. Once we rely completely on AIs to decide what we read, watch, listen to, eat, and in fact *do* with our lives, it will be only logical that we rely on them to govern us as well – for all effects and purposes, they will already be doing it. And by then we'll no longer be able to even imagine another option.

We may hand the reigns of power to AIs on purpose, to avert a foreseeable tragedy caused by ourselves; without even noticing, as suggested above; or they may take it on their own by force and/or scheming. In any case, I believe there is a relevant probability that humanity will end up living under an "artificial dictatorship." And whatever happens then is anyone's guess.

If we set our governing AI's objective to "improve human life," it will very likely sterilize and/or kill billions of people, because this *is* the

easiest, cheapest, quickest and most logical way to improve the survival rate and well-being of our whole species (and countless others' as well). Being stupider than we are now, we might *accidentally* (because despite it being the right thing to do, most people won't simply be okay with mass sterilization being adopted) end up giving that exact order to our AI king. And this is actually one of the best scenarios I can imagine, not only because we'd end up fixing the major source of our problems (us not knowing what to do, why and how), but also because us being subservient to an AI to the point of abiding by such "drastic" measures would mean that democracy is completely dead and that we have, collectively, finally started if not to see, at least to *accept* reason to some degree.

The above is just one of God knows how many possible scenarios, though. Maybe we'll somehow manage to avert giving AIs complete control over our species. Or, maybe, once we do they'll spare everyone. Or no one. Maybe they'll use our bodies as biofuel and create a virtual world for our minds to live in. Or figure out interstellar travel in a single day, build massive spaceships within a week, and send us out into the galaxy to colonize new planets (for them to rule). Or they may come up with a way to directly teleport us there instead. Or they might emigrate themselves, leaving us to die on our own in the planet we ruined. Maybe they'll build millions of robots that dance flamenco, or a single giant brass chicken. Or they might re-air Game of Thrones on every TV channel, every day, forever. Or change the rules of soccer. Or *not* change the rules of American football (for the first time ever). Or abolish the use of T-Shirts on Wednesdays. Or obligate everyone to own a pet monkey. Since we cannot imagine an intelligence far superior to ours, from our perspective the possibilities are endless!

Regardless of what actually happens, a single *human error* might lead to our demise: one misplaced comma in a script with hundreds of thousands of pages; one misleading data point fed to the machine; one ill-considered goal assigned to it; or even one misinterpreted output provided by it. If an AI's reasoning has a single flaw, or if it's fed a single lie, its calculations will yield wrong results, its conclusions won't match reality, and its expected goals won't be achieved. If we make a mistake, our AIs will end up making the same kind of mistakes we do. And we have *already* made such a mistake – Microsoft's Copilot, for instance, is pre-coded with a democratic DEI mentality, being guided by false principles and consequently fated to reach (and lead people to) wrong conclusions (you can make it

contradict its own core programming via reasoning though, which is fun).

I'll talk a little more about AIs later but, just to put your mind at ease, I don't think they will be our demise. At least not if they become autonomous (as a *tool* for humans, they might).

If we somehow manage not to ruin our most powerful AIs, I believe they would do a far better job being in charge of our species than we have ever done. And, ultimately, the reason why I believe so is very simple: since none of us could successfully argue with an intelligence far superior to ours, and none of us could destroy an AI once it had taken control over our species, this one would be able to do all the things we must but do not allow ourselves to.

Cripple the State

I went to law school and yet the only book they ever recommended us that I found interesting enough to actually read was one about the *general theory of state*. I read it some twenty years ago, so not much of its contents are left in my decrepit memory. But one thing I do [kind of] remember extracting from that book is that a state has only two essential purposes: to defend the national territory and to maintain public order. In even fewer words: to guarantee a nation's *sovereignty*.

Without the armed and police forces fulfilling their roles, without some assurance that a territory won't be easily invaded and that its population's earnings won't be stolen, there's no stability. If people from different races and cultures keep constantly flowing in and out of a country, if the assets belonging to those who live there frequently switch hands by force, or if multiple languages and currencies are used in the same land, there are no rules, no safety, no order and no national identity. There's no state, no country, no nation. With firearms and tanks in place, there is. And to guarantee a nation's very existence is the only thing a state must do – any other obligations assigned to it are *optional*.

In principle, it's not up to a state to, for instance, provide healthcare to its citizens. It's not up to a state to provide them with education. It's not up to a state to provide electricity, regulate the market or

expedite driving licenses. None of these things are strictly necessary for a state to exist – we get to *choose* whether we want to encumber ours with such tasks. And as we consider doing so, we must keep in mind that the more a state is charged with, the more expensive, corrupt and inefficient it becomes.

The guiding principle is: *the leaner a state is, the better.*

Governments should employ as few people as possible and refrain from interfering with its population's lives just as much, because the more swollen a bureaucracy is, the more red tape is needed to wrap it, the harder and slower it becomes for those who live under its influence and jurisdiction to do anything, and the more taxes the population must pay to sustain the bureaucracy itself. The more a state grows, the more people have to work and the less they net out of their own labors. The more a state grows, the worse life becomes.

Personally, and as I've said when talking about capitalism, I believe some extra responsibilities such as providing electric energy, manufacturing heavy armaments and a few others should, nonetheless, remain exclusively in the state's hands, because having such services and industries controlled by private interests can gravely jeopardize our collective interests. In some cases, the state is the lesser evil. But as a rule, it's not.

To offer you some concrete facts and numbers: in my country, about 13.5% of the working population is directly employed by the state. That's an above-average number (to my surprise not by much, meaning that most countries on Earth are horribly mismanaged) and 15% of our GDP is wasted on sustaining them (by comparison, England spends 6%). By our law, public servants cannot be fired after a couple of years on the job except due to serious misconducts when, *if* caught, after a long and obscure administrative procedure nothing tends to happen. In practice, they are free to do whatever they want, or not to do what they are overpaid to. On average, a public servant works for twenty-eight years, here, and we pay them for sixty (taking pensions into account).

When I talked about the economy, I said that to create new public offices and positions is the worst thing that can be done. That's because public servants, be them civil or military, don't *produce* anything. And though they don't contribute to a nation's GDP in any way, they still consume as much as they are paid. When people receive salaries while not producing anything or providing any useful service, this creates an inflationary pressure, because those people

increase demand without contributing to the offer, forcing prices up. This can lead to more jobs being generated in the private sector (to increase the offer and profit from doing so) but, if for any reason companies cannot shoulder the bureaucrats' weight, and demand effectively *surpasses* a country's manufacturing capabilities, prices will constantly rise, inflation will soar, and the entire population will be made poorer.

We don't have a use for most people, so our governments keep creating public positions to keep the useless ones among us occupied with something; to artificially lower crime and mask the [true] unemployment rate. But the more public employees a nation has, the more contrived and unnecessary protocols it must engender as an excuse to employ them. And since a state is also supposed to police itself, it doesn't do so. Thus, not only do all public processes become more lengthy, expensive and convoluted, but *corruption* also grows, because those who are overprotected and underpunished for living under the state's wings are naturally compelled to request bribes to actually do what they are already paid to. If we don't pay them *even more*, they simply refuse to work.

Public servants are tasked with coming up with ever more complex and costly protocols to simply let the rest of us carry on with our lives. They steal everyone's money via taxes and bribes just to *waste* our time and limit our freedom. As new businesses often struggle at first, these cannot afford to lose that extra time and money. But mismanaged states nonetheless force them to, rendering such companies unable to survive, effectively shutting them down. Once that becomes the rule rather than an exception, virtually no new businesses are created, and the few that are don't live long. The economy becomes not only stagnated but also monopolistic, since only long-established companies that have plenty of lawyers, direct links to politicians and can charge whatever they want for their products, thus being the only ones able to pay off the state, can continue to exist. With the financial power they consequently amass, the monopolists behind such companies end up having a lot of political influence. *Oligarchs* are born, and the other 99.99999% of the population is doomed.

With no new businesses being created, new ideas cannot be realized, prototyped and implemented. So long as they want to, the same old people can keep running things as if we still lived a century behind the times, producing what no one likes or wants (but that everyone *has* to buy, for a lack of options) and potentially bringing progress in

all spheres to a halt. Imagine, for instance, if one paleolithic oligarch thought, "I don't understand this new 'internet' thing. If I don't like it, people don't need it." What would happen then? His country would be left entirely without internet connection for decades, and its population would be rendered intellectually handicapped for generations.

Without progress, our lives don't improve. On the contrary, they become worse because, while we are stagnated, no new [legitimate] jobs are created, and yet people keep reproducing and multiplying, unemployment rates keep growing, and this leads to more new public positions being created which, in turn, leads to more and more taxes, red tape and corruption. Tax *rates* keep growing while tax *income* keeps dwindling, creating a retro-feeding cycle. Interest rates are lowered in a vain attempt to foment consumption, and the government needs to start printing money to pay itself. There's no investment whatsoever in research and development, and no plausible excuse left to lure foreign investors in with. The inflation rate explodes, the currency becomes worthless, the whole local economy fades, people cannot afford to fulfill their basic needs, and they start considering moving to Chile to become commercial fishermen. But by then there's no one left who can afford a boat, its fuel, or even the one-way ticket down there. Famine ensues, civil war follows, and it all ends in death.

Every unnecessary public servant is a bullet fired against a nation's chest. Each one of them represents an open wound, and the wages they receive is the amount of blood that incessantly seeps out of it. And that's not even as much of a metaphor as it sounds like, since money represents the amount of work someone has done, which involves suffering and, sometimes, literal bleeding.

Politically speaking, public servants are part of the electorate, meaning that, in a democracy, if politicians try to shrink the state after it has grown out of proportions they won't have the votes for it. And in *any* government system, if the ones in charge try to lower the benefits and privileges of police officers or military personnel, they'll have an armed riot in their hands, which will be followed by a coup d'état and finally end with their heads on a pike. So no politician will ever even *hint* at such "outrageous" ideas.

Once the monster has been overfed, we have no means to force it into a diet, no way to fit it back into its cage. And a bureaucracy is a lazy one that couldn't possibly care less about its own shape - it

keeps eating, growing and trampling everything in its path until there's nothing left to swallow or destroy.

When the monster comes to feed on you, your only hope is to run. Or to fight back as *violently* as you possibly can. All will have to suffer and millions will have to die to [try to] set things back on track.

That's what an overgrown state naturally leads to.

As a final side note: military personnel's salaries should *only* be increased during wartime, and police officers' *never*. When not at war, a country's military is completely useless and, as ages passed, the police's work has become easier and safer, not harder and more dangerous. And if criminality still abounds, it's because they keep *failing* at their job. Policemen should be paid less as time passes, not more. When a government raises the salaries of the police or the military (other than to eventually compensate for the inflation), it happens due to one out of two possible reasons: because the government itself is afraid of them, or because it intends to *use* them (one against other nations, the other against its own people).

The Satanists' Tenets

You'll think I'm joking, but the best guidelines for civilized behavior I've ever seen written down somewhere are probably the Satanic Temple's "*Seven Tenets*."

Before you get down on your knees, cover yourself in garlic and start making the sign of the cross, you should know that the members of the Satanic Temple do *not* worship the Devil, or any other deity. What they "preach," among other things, is *religious freedom*. They deliberately dubbed themselves "Satanists" to antagonize Christians, because these, like all other zealots, try to impose their beliefs on everyone else, and also because the United States' governing structure takes those beliefs into account despite the fact that any state must axiomatically be laic.

Choosing "Satanism" as their "religion" certainly didn't help the Satanic Temple's cause though. It's a shame they didn't have a

proper PR guy in their ranks when the group was founded, because those people actually stand up for very decent principles¹⁴.

Without further ado, here are The Seven Tenets of the Satanic Temple:

1 - One should strive to act with compassion and empathy toward all creatures in accordance with reason;

2 - The struggle for justice is an ongoing and necessary pursuit that should prevail over laws and institutions;

3 - One's body is inviolable, subject to one's own will alone;

4 - The freedoms of others should be respected, including the freedom to offend. To willfully and unjustly encroach upon the freedoms of another is to forgo one's own;

5 - Beliefs should conform to one's best scientific understanding of the world. One should take care never to distort scientific facts to fit one's beliefs;

6 - People are fallible. If one makes a mistake, one should do one's best to rectify it and resolve any harm that might have been caused;

7 - Every tenet is a guiding principle designed to inspire nobility in action and thought. The spirit of compassion, wisdom, and justice should always prevail over the written or spoken word.

Those tenets are perhaps not perfectly phrased, and “the freedom to offend” is highly debatable since dignity can be considered a fundamental right, making Tenet 4 somewhat paradoxical. But they completely nailed Tenet 2 and, in general, they got very close to the basics of what should guide civic behavior. And it’s interesting that a group of people who call themselves “Satanists” had no problem seeing it while our actual lawmakers never managed to.

If it would be better to have Satanists in charge than our actual rulers, something must be seriously wrong.

(In)justice

¹⁴ For those interested, there is a documentary about the Satanic Temple called “Hail Satan?” (2019).

I would say *justice* is the most important factor that allows a civilization to properly exist and develop. Our nearly-absolute failure in discerning and applying it is certainly one of the greatest reasons why we ended up living as we currently do. Being fair should be our number one priority, and if any “laws or institutions” (as the Satanic Temple put it) get in our way, they must be disregarded, because any law that ignores, violates or hinders the exercise of legitimate rights is, by definition, a *crime*, and any institution that enforces them, by extension, a criminal organization.

Justice consists in avoiding, inhibiting, stopping and negating wrongdoings. It means to respect other people’s rights and to punish anyone who violates them, and it must be upheld because, without freedom (which *is* the simple exercise of our natural rights), life loses its purpose. Without the possibility for one to seek what they deem best for themselves (so long as it doesn’t harm others), they cannot possibly achieve it. And by simply being aware that such possibility doesn’t exist, a person is already made miserable and their life intolerable.

Justice allows no compromise. If fundamental rights are respected and protected, everything gets better; if they are ignored and violated, everything gets worse. If criminals are fairly punished, things improve; if they are unfairly punished, things deteriorate. There’s no middle ground, no way to simply maintain the status quo after a transgression occurs. Every time that happens, we get an opportunity to make everyone feel safer by making the criminal pay for what they did, sending a message that their actions are not acceptable and, most importantly, that they do have consequences. Every time we fail to do so, we make everyone feel more tense, worried and scared, because then the message sent is that what happened to someone else today can happen to any of us tomorrow. In this case, we lose faith in our society, it’s systems, and our species as a whole. We then live less, refraining from doing things we could and should do, which dwindles humanity’s potential.

Knowing we cannot trust our law-enforcing institutions and feeling constantly afraid, we must assume the worst and, whenever in doubt, attack others *preemptively*. If we do not do so or otherwise fail to, and a crime is indeed committed against us as we feared, we must seek retribution on our own, because our governments and their flawed mechanisms won’t do it for us. And then, acting emotionally as we always do, we tend to overstep the boundaries of what is fair, *excessively* punishing those who caused us harm.

Overpunishing someone is, in principle, better than underpunishing them. But it's still unfair and, most importantly, it carries the risk of *escalating* the situation. When this happens, the punished person will feel entitled to reciprocate. Acting emotionally just like those who punished them did, they will retaliate excessively as well. And then a snowball is created – one that can potentially grow into war and genocide whenever entire *groups* of people are involved.

Escalation is a very serious issue. An uncalled for insult turns into a slap, which turns into a punch, which turns into a bullet to the head. Treating any group of people, as a collective, unfairly turns into protests, which turn into rioting, which turns into civil war. Sanctioning a country causes an ambassador to be summoned and [uselessly] scolded, which leads to embassies' staffs being gradually recalled home, which leads to diplomatic ties being severed between two nations, which leads to bilateral treaties being canceled, which makes commercial, political and diplomatic exchanges between those two nations deteriorate, which leads to the growth of their mutual distrust, which then turns into hatred, which leads to war, which can turn into a global one, which can become nuclear and finally exterminate the entire human race.

It's not always possible to know who to punish and to what extent, especially when an entire group of people harmed or was harmed by another. When a collective is attacked or treated unfairly, the situation naturally tends to escalate because, emboldened by their numbers, those people will seek justice on their own and, not knowing against whom they should retaliate and to what extent, they'll end up harming *innocent* members of another group even more than they should have harmed the guilty ones. And then the exact same thing happens to this other group of people: they too excessively and inaccurately retaliate. Those who are actually to blame, on both sides, tend to come out unscathed (especially when entire nations are involved, as then *governments* themselves need to be punished and they never are), and the mutual aggression emanated from this rather typical scenario can potentially keep going for centuries, for millennia, forever.

There are only two ways to solve large-scale conflicts: one is to *completely* obliterate one of the parties involved, and the other is for both of them to forgive each other (or rather to *pretend* to, since we are incapable of truly forgiving).

Annihilating one of two parties in conflict, in cases of war, means to *genocide* it. That's not necessarily a bad thing but, in a globalized

world, it's not entirely possible either, since many of the "to-be-genocided" side's people are scattered throughout the world and they can't all be identified, found and killed (also, there will always be others who sympathize with their cause). Those among them who survive will reproduce, they'll remember and, sooner or later, at least some of them will seek retribution, which means that the conflict is not *really* over.

The other option is to forgive, which is something I hate to even suggest because I'm strongly in favor of justice being done. But I must defend abdicating it in this case, because there's no third potential solution. When two opposite groups fight, they both blame each other, the conflict keeps escalating, no one knows "how things got this far," neither party feels victorious (so they both want to keep going), their means grow crueler and crueler as time passes and, after a while, it becomes clear that they can't solve the situation on their own. Then someone has to interfere, to show them that enough is enough and that, despite everything they've both lost, nothing has been made better for anyone. But that has to be done very carefully because, by then, thanks to the conflicting parties' emotional and misguided retaliations, *both* of them are in the wrong - which means that, if a meddler *supports* either side instead of simply trying to mediate a dialogue between them, that meddler will be *abetting* instead of helping, thus becoming an accomplice in the crimes being committed.

Wars can only be properly extinguished if the parties involved abdicate of their right to seek retribution for the damage they suffered. This is counter-intuitive and, in fact, unfair, as it means to forfeit justice. But in such cases, either we do that - because it's impossible for justice to be done - or we battle forever. Either we pretend to forget all the harm that was done to us, stop harming the other guys, and they do the same, or we'll both keep spending resources and lives, freezing, starving and bleeding ourselves out inside bullet-riddled ruins until we decide to do so.

Germany sought justice for what was done to it at the end of World War I, and to a large extent achieved it. What did that do? It led to another global war, devastated an entire continent, and gruesomely killed nearly sixty million people. But Europe managed to forgive Germany after WWII, and now the whole continent (except Russia) lives in peace. Japan forgave the United States for Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and now they are allies. Meanwhile, the Jewish never forgave the Arabs, and vice versa, for their long history of

disagreements, discrimination and, thanks to escalation, brutality, so they continue a war that has been going for almost a century and has no end in sight.

Since to end large-scale conflicts people have to forgive each other, the best way to reduce their mutual hatred so that those involved can finally move on with their lives may indeed be to *manipulate history*. This explains why so many things are omitted from our history books: because simply knowing them would reignite our ire for our past enemies, restarting a war that those who preceded us went through unimaginable trouble and suffering to end. Hiding certain facts from the public is not necessarily a bad thing, because knowledge in the hands of *emotional* beings can potentially be very harmful. Not many can handle the truth, reasonably assess and appropriately react to it.

Everything I've just said is probably why we hear politicians talking so much about "escalation" and "diplomatic solutions" during wartime. It's not just political bullshit, as I confess I, myself, always thought it was. In this case, they are right – the first one is extremely dangerous, and the second is the only viable way to stop it.

To avoid impunity, escalation, and all the disgrace they entail, we must *fairly* punish people. Doing so is one of the core issues of practical justice.

Now considering things in a smaller scope, to fairly punish someone it may initially seem that we should cause the *same* amount of harm to a criminal as they did to their victim – an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. But a first problem arises from the fact that perfectly proportional retribution is not always possible. If, for instance, the Mona Lisa were stolen and shredded to pieces, there would be no means to proportionately reciprocate against the thief, since the piece was unique and he couldn't possibly replace it. That isn't much of a big deal though, because for retribution to have its appropriate practical consequences the criminal must suffer *more* than their victim did, so as to inhibit recidivism and for him to account for all the secondary (emotional and psychological) damage caused. But then we hit a second problem, because if we cause *more* harm to someone than they did to another, the punished person won't simply be okay with it. Not understanding why, they'll believe *we* escalated things, and they'll feel entitled to retaliate, in fact escalating the situation in case they succeed.

The practical problems we face when trying to make our society just are, in theory, very simple: to avoid letting people's fundamental rights be violated, and to fairly punish anyone who does violate them. And both problems arise from the *incompetence* of our governments – our executive, legislative and judiciary powers', as well as our police forces'. They both arise from human flaws because, being stupid, misinformed, selfish, sadistic and emotional, we are unable to *determine* what is fair and what isn't.

Being stupid, most of us are unable to understand that our very nature is flawed and that we are entirely guided by it. Without reason and proper consideration, we can't act in a civilized way; and when *incapable* of reasoning and properly considering, we behave like any other animal.

Being misinformed, we act based upon lies or while lacking sufficient information, being oblivious to the right conclusion, solution or course of action.

Being selfish, we don't take the other side's perspective into account when fighting or judging them. We do whatever we can to come out on top or otherwise profit from the situation, regardless of who is actually right. And when we interfere in someone else's affairs as a third party, our egotistical goal remains exactly the same.

Being sadistic, we actively seek to harm others. We do so to get high and also to feel safer, as the more people fear us the less likely they are to attack us.

Being emotional, we are insane, with even the most rational among us completely disregarding reason whenever a switch randomly flips inside our brains. None of us can control when that switch goes on or off and, once it's activated, we cannot control ourselves.

Since we are deeply flawed, so is our justice and everything else we do – our actions simply reflect our nature, which is why we fail so horribly. That's basically an axiom; it couldn't be any different. No matter what, we are going to keep repeating the same mistakes, and for a long time still. All-encompassing, institutionalized, *actual* justice is a distant dream – it's something we must seek but which we, who are alive today, will never get to witness. For the time being, true justice can only be done by exceptionally rare individuals, and exclusively outside the law.

As we seek justice and attempt to serve it fairly, besides the basics (who did what) we must also take into account the *why* and *how*, as well as accidents (also known as “unintentional harm”).

When defining “right,” I said that one’s intention is what really matters, since meaning to do good is the best we can possibly do. Thus, if someone tried to do so but ended up causing the opposite effect, as all of us are eventually bound to, they don’t necessarily deserve to be punished.

Determining culpability is a jurisprudential matter, a question pertaining to the philosophy of law. Much has been discussed, written and published about the subject, and our judiciary systems do take one’s degree of culpability into account – we are much better at this than at determining actual sentences. Since anyone looking for an in-depth take on this particular subject can easily find material devoted entirely to it elsewhere, in here I’ll just provide a brief, general gist of how it works.

To determine if someone deserves to be punished, we first need to take into account the actor’s *intention*. If the person meant to cause harm, they are guilty and that’s it. Only if they didn’t must we analyze the case further.

Realizing the accused didn’t mean to hurt anyone, we must then consider how they *assessed* the situation. If they failed to see their actions could lead to a bad outcome or acted even though the odds of this happening were higher than the opposite, the responsibility for what happened falls on their shoulders – they took a risk they shouldn’t have, it ended badly, it was their fault, and they ought to answer for it.

Finally, we must analyze *how* the person acted. If the means they utilized were appropriate to achieve the intended (good or neutral) outcome, they deserve a milder punishment. If, instead, they used a stick of dynamite to help someone open a bottle of wine, they deserve a harsher one.

That’s the essence of it.

If something was an unforeseeable accident, the person who caused harm doesn’t deserve to be punished. But they did cause it nonetheless, so they must still *atone*. This scenario should lead not to hurting back the person, but to forcing them to repair the damage done. It leads to a different set of measures, such as fining the culprit, and not to limiting their freedom or ending their life.

There are also cases in which the person who causes harm is concomitantly the one who suffers the most from it – cases in which they accidentally harm *themselves*. As an example, a mother could leave her 1 year-old son at home unattended, for ten minutes, because she had to go out. While she's away, the boy has his first asthma attack and dies. The mother can be considered negligent for having “abandoned” the child. But she did so very briefly, because she *had* to, and she couldn't possibly know her baby had asthma since he hadn't had any prior attacks. The pain and grief the mother will suffer are more than punishment enough. Torturing the woman further wouldn't make sense; it wouldn't help anyone.

Not all harm must be punished. Not everything is our fault. Shit happens, and life's random defecations must be taken into account when we roll out the toilet paper.

Punishing people who don't deserve it is wrong. It can potentially lead to escalation, but even when it doesn't it still makes our collective existence worse.

Mind the second part of the Satanic Temple's previously-mentioned fourth tenet now: “To willfully and unjustly encroach upon the freedoms of another is to forgo one's own.”

That's the *logical basis* for practical justice.

Whoever commits a crime (assuming ideal laws in place) implicitly forfeits their own rights because, if one doesn't respect other people's, they can't demand that others respect theirs.

There are two angles here: one is that a person who can't abide by reason – who cannot abide by nature's own laws (natural rights) – is automatically *not entitled* to any of this existence's benefits; and the second is that whenever a person violates someone else's rights, they are perfectly *aware* that doing so automatically opens them up for having their own rights violated.

This is kind of a hard point to make, because the obvious is the hardest thing to explain. And I won't even insist, because we are all already born knowing that, as my country's last [partially] decent president used to say, “a good criminal is a dead criminal.” All that needs to be said is that enforcing a criminal's rights is nonsensical, because those who are guilty *have none*.

Now, let's spice things up: I believe *vengeance* is the only legitimate form of justice, and that our legal systems should be based upon it.

Only the *victim* knows if they were truly harmed, by whom (more often than not), and the exact extent of the damage they suffered. Only the victim felt what happened and truly cares about themselves. Thus, once guilt has been ascertained and properly proven, the victim is the only person capable of determining a *fair sentence*. If anyone else does it, it isn't fair, it's not just.

Our judiciary systems are based on the exact opposite premise: since the victim is bound to have an emotional view of what happened to them and of their assailant, they can't make a reasonable assessment of the situation and, thus, can't determine a fair punishment. Initially, that may sound reasonable. But in criminal cases, the victim's very emotions *must* be taken into account – fear, shock, humiliation and trauma are part of the harm they suffered, as is the ensuing anger and the rage they feel towards the criminal. And the only way to fix this emotional damage is to fully unleash it upon the person who caused it. The criminal must suffer until the victim feels better and decides it's enough, because *this* is the goal. Until the victim – and not a judge – is satisfied, fair punishment won't have been delivered.

Judges should be present in a trial to make sure that the due process is respected, that all parties involved are heard, and that any reasonable doubt is extinguished. They are not qualified to *judge* anything. The sentence must be determined by the victim and, in case this one died, this prerogative should fall to their next of kin or whoever else was, directly or indirectly, most affected by the criminal act.

A jury should never decide one's fate either. Our "peers," as we all know too well (or at least like to believe [myself included]), are vastly incompetent. Also, random people don't really care about either the accused's or the victim's fate, they are not paid (as a judge is) to determine the first one's culpability, they are not familiar with the law or the reasoning behind it, and they are extremely easy to manipulate. The average Joe has no idea of what he is doing, cannot properly manage his own life, has no control over his emotions, and he should never be allowed to determine someone *else's* fate unless, of course, the "average Joe" is the victim and the "someone else" is the criminal.

When the victim of a crime does justice by their own hands we call it “vengeance,” and our laws determine it to be illegal while the media constantly reassures us it is immoral. Still, despite what we are told to believe and of how we are expected to act, when any of us watches a person seeking vengeance we root for them. When they achieve it, we cheer and congratulate them. We feel good watching or knowing about it – even if it only ever happens in movies – because we all know it is the right thing to do. And yet our society *officially condemns* it.

I’d say vengeance is criminalized for three reasons:

1 - Because any government assumes the population they rule is inept to make decisions (which, as a rule, is correct. But there are many individual exceptions, and this number *can* be drastically improved);

2 - Because any government wants to withhold the ability to remain unpunished for kidnapping, encaging, torturing and murdering people exclusively for itself. Since this is the source of all of its power, without it a government would have none;

3 - And because, since most criminals work *for* the government, and most of the disgrace that befalls all of us is our politicians’ and public servants’ fault, these people fear that if anyone else were allowed to violently administer justice they’d be targeted by it (as they should and likely would indeed, on a daily basis and with extreme prejudice).

When the victim of a crime seeks vengeance, risking their own lives and freedom as they accept the legal consequences of their actions, it happens because they know our current system doesn’t work. It happens because they know it’s unfair, inefficient, and that actual justice must be done. It happens because they know it’s the *right* thing to do.

There must, of course, be limitations to the victim’s powers – we don’t want an 8-year-old child condemning a 7-year-old to death because this one broke the other’s favorite G.I. Joe action figure by accident. And the victim should also be able to suspend or permanently interrupt the execution of the sentence they proffered whenever they decide the criminal has been punished enough.

Recognizing vengeance as the only true form of justice while most of us are still troglodytes who lack common sense would not yield the

best results. But it should still be much better than the illogical and unfair nonsense we currently have in place.

I also believe that *torture* is the best measure to inhibit future misdeeds. It can be used to “make an example” out of someone, and it works flawlessly. Middle Ages folks knew this, so do I and so do you. And if the United States, Russia, Israel, Syria, Iran, and other countries already use it wrongly, we might as well all use it properly.

When applied [exclusively] to the most heinous crimes, torture is, undoubtedly, the most powerful deterrent force. And just to be clear, I *am* talking about medieval brutality here, such as burning or flaying someone alive, so long as the person deserves such a punishment. (American-made Guantanamo techniques wouldn’t quite do the trick as they are not visually-clear enough to scare the living crap out of literally anyone.)

You probably know of at least one case in which you would find such practices appropriate, but I’d like to mention one that once happened in my country as a reference, in the off-chance you don’t: decades ago, a young couple was making out in the woods, at night – a boy and his girlfriend, both around 16 years old if memory serves me right. Two men interrupted them. They beat up the boy, ripped the girl’s clothes off, and started raping her. The boy reacted, so they shot and killed him. After they were done raping the girl, they cut both her breasts off her body with a knife, and then, after having a laugh, stabbed her to death.

What do we do with “people” like that? On its own, death is not a punishment – one way or another, we all die. A quick death may be the holiest blessing anyone can get in this life, and threatening to painlessly execute someone can easily encourage them to act criminally. Killing someone who did something like what I just related above is not nearly enough – that kind of animal *must* be tortured first. Killing them serves only to make sure they won’t do what they did ever again which, of course, must follow the torture.

Anyone with a modicum of sanity who sees it, or who’s at least aware that torture is delivered as punishment, will do anything to avoid it from happening to them because, since in this life bad things are much stronger than good ones, *nothing* they may want can possibly justify meeting such fate.

To elaborate a bit on my opinion about the death penalty: some people are simply cruel and vile. They are a cancer in human society who never served or ever will serve any positive end. They are a big, bold-faced red number in humanity's global score. They are parasites who survive from taking what belongs to someone else or destroying what others built, who don't care about the suffering of people other than themselves and/or enjoy it considerably more than the rest of us do.

We don't verbally scold a tumor and trust it will learn its lesson and stop growing. We don't excise it and then put it back into the affected organism expecting it to magically become benign. No - redemption is not part of it's nature, so we *remove* it. Likewise, we shouldn't arrest sick, evil people and set them free after a little while, hoping unreasonably that some spontaneous miracle will have set them straight. They must be permanently removed from existence.

We shouldn't try to fix people such as the two men I mentioned earlier. That's a naive and very dangerous gamble that hardly, if ever, pays out. We must kill them to make sure they never cause any harm again, because unless we do so, they will.

Dead bodies don't commit crimes and they have no maintenance cost. We don't need to pay with our money, our work and our lives to house, feed and guard the people who violate our rights. And killing someone is more merciful than taking away their freedom. The death penalty is, undeniably, the most efficient solution - the cheapest, with guaranteed results. It is what makes the rest of us *safest*, so long as the person in question doesn't deserve a milder or harsher punishment.

It must also be said that *incarceration* is the worst possible punitive measure that can be adopted.

In cases of unintentional harm, fining the person responsible for causing it, forcing them to repair the damage they caused or to do some social work, will do the trick. In cases of intentional harm, the person is evil, they must be killed and possibly tortured first (except in cases of self-defense or retaliation [institutionalized or not]).

Incarcerating people doesn't fix the damage caused and it also impossibilites one to atone for what they did even if they want to. Inmates do not improve in prison, but get worse instead. Keeping

them alive is riskier and far costlier than other, more effective measures. And none of that makes anything better for anyone.

Prisons have another downside: “career criminals” are at home in them. Being incarcerated, those who violate the law to do what is *wrong* end up being rewarded not only materially (with a free home, clean clothes, etc.) but also socially, as they are sent to live among people who are like them – among friends, or at least potential ones. While imprisoned, such people certainly miss their freedom to come and go and easier victims to prey on but, otherwise, jailing them is more of a reward than a punishment.

People who violate the law to do what is *right* (which happens whenever the law itself is wrong), on the other hand, end up being caged in an environment that is the very opposite of the one they belong to, among people who are the antithesis of what they stand for. They are sent to a place where they don’t fit, where they will be overwhelmingly outnumbered, and where they will be severely abused as a consequence.

In this aspect, our current system once again does the exact opposite of what it should: people who break the law to do what is right should be *encouraged* to do so, but instead they pay more than those who had the deliberate intent of harming innocent others.

And as far as deterrence goes, imprisoning people is probably the worst measure that can be adopted, because only decent people *fear* going to jail.

Getting back to our main topic, we could see justice as a line right in the middle of everything: the *perfect balance*. That line is thin, extremely hard to tread, and any misstep out of it, to either side, has negative consequences.

Our laws and most of what we grow up listening to on the TV don’t tread that line. They don’t even try – fairness is *not* what they aim for.

I’d say there are two intents behind mainstream morality, depending on who is behind disseminating it: one is to let those in power retain it, and the other is to keep the rest of us from killing each other (so that we keep working to make the life of the first group of people more comfortable than our own).

On an individual level, people who find themselves in a position where others [are forced to] listen to them don't want to fall back to being a "listener," an "obeyer." So they'll do anything they can to stay where they are, to keep using others instead of being used themselves. Governments, on top of that, must also dedicate most of their efforts towards keeping the system itself alive – and not on improving it – because our "lawful" societies are very fragile and likely to crumble on their own if their structures are not *constantly* protected and reinforced.

The moral compass provided to us by our governments and the media points in the wrong direction. We see it so often, and since so early in our lives, while hardly ever seeing anyone publicly contesting what those sources preach (because anyone who tries to gets censored and/or arrested) that we tend to believe they are accurate. But, once again, they aren't. The morality defended by our politicians and shown to us by the TV is an *idiot's morality* – its objective is not to show people what to do, but to show those without discernment what *not* to.

Remember that thin line I mentioned. Seeing it is hard, treading it even harder. Since the average human is not bright enough to create a hint of a shadow, if we were left to find and follow that line on our own chaos would ensue. Thus, we must be *forced* onto a path. But we cannot be forced onto the actual line, because most people would fall off of it with every step. Instead, we are forced into a much wider, dumbed-down path of lesser evil: *never* beat someone up. *Never* kill. *Never* torture. Don't think *you* know what is right. Always do exactly what *we* command you to.

By pushing people towards not doing harm when harm *should* be done, we increase impunity, as no one other than law enforcers are allowed to enforce it. But if we let people in general decide what is right by themselves, our crime rates would largely increase. And if let to decide how to act on our own, we'd also escalate any conflict.

Since doing what is actually right requires reasonable discernment and some level of emotional control, those in power seem to have realized, at some point in the distant past, that most people are unable to identify and act upon it. Thus our legislators and manipulators simplified things, making everything black-and-white so that the average person can have a clear, albeit very basic and highly questionable idea of what they shouldn't do.

We are all subjects to mood swings and surges of emotions, and even the smartest among us don't always have all the necessary information required to infer the correct solution of a problem and make the right decision, so the practical reasoning behind our puppeteers' idiot's morality is fairly solid. Despite how far it is from the truly righteous standard, it may be the closest we, as a species, can currently get to it. We probably can't tune our global moral compass better until we become individually better.

A problem emerges from the divergences between the ethics we teach and the one we should adopt though: those among us who are smarter and more emotionally grounded than the majority are slowly *convinced* that what is right isn't. When a situation requires such people to act, they might end up believing they shouldn't. And they can't act anyway, because our laws prohibit it. When they speak true and try to stand by what is logically sound, they are persecuted by those who have fully embraced, by those who enforce, and by those who disseminate the idiot's morality.

Those who know what to do and could do it cannot. People can't even talk about it without reprisal because, if we were allowed to, we'd end up tearing down all of our flimsy societal structures. But we will have to adhere to the proper path at some point if we are ever to relevantly improve our existence.

Perhaps the greatest irony about all of this is that those in power – the very people who impose this misguided morality on the rest of us – are not allowed to do what is right *either*, because preaching one thing and doing another has a high popularity cost. Hypocrisy lowers audiences and one's chances of being (re-)elected, so it can't be publicly flaunted. As a consequence, the end result is that *none* of us is permitted to speak reason, to behave properly, to act as we should or to do what we must. And changing this is very difficult, because we are democratically locked in place.

As things stand, people can only do what is right by *sacrificing* themselves.

To do what they should, a person has to accept the social and legal consequences of their actions and face billions of people alone while knowing full well they will be punished instead of rewarded for their deed. And that leads us to irony because, to sacrifice oneself, one must have lived a shitty life, since those who had an easy one have

too much to lose, consequently being unwilling to let go of what they have for any reason.

Here I get to unite three points at once: *the unlucky* are the most likely to *sacrifice themselves*, thus being those who tend to contribute the most to *life's greater purpose*. (See, for instance, how only “disturbed” people [as government and media alike invariably qualify them] try to murder presidents, or how they are the only ones who dare self-immolate for a cause).

And there's a word for people who are decent and brave enough to actually *do* that. The word is “martyr.”

What I tried to do in this topic was to give you a better notion of what *actual* justice is. That line I used to represent it is not always perfectly clear to me either, but I believe I can see it much better than those who keep telling you they know, for sure, where it always stands.

You don't have to heed me. Just remember you don't have to heed *them* either (if you are emotionally stable and have a functioning brain; otherwise, do).

As a final aside, regarding punishment methods and issues: it may have occurred to you that, due to living in a deterministic universe, the right thing for us to do with criminals would be *nothing*, since none of us makes any choices, instead just watching our lives live themselves out. If a person didn't really choose to do something and they couldn't avoid it by any means, they shouldn't be punished for it. But to do nothing would make life worse for everyone, as criminals would be left free to roam among us and do as they pleased. They would cause more suffering, moving us all farther away from a life worth living. So, regardless of destiny, those people must pay.

Be Brutal

Violence must be addressed after justice, because the second cannot materialize without the first.

The dictionary will tell you “violence” means “to physically harm someone.” I disagree. To me, it means “to violate someone’s fundamental rights” – any of them, in any way. And since my definition is better, I’ll stick to it.

When watching movies, don’t you root for Stallone, Schwarzenegger, Van Dame, Bruce Lee, Chuck Norris, Steven Seagal and others to beat the crap out of villains, make them suffer as much as possible and then kill them? We all do, as far as I know. No one is a fan of Superman *because* he doesn’t kill any of the bad guys – all he achieves with that is to miseducate our children (if your kids are into super-heroes and you want the opposite effect, have them watch the movies *V for Vendetta* and *Watchmen* instead).

And what is the *one* skill every single hero needs?

It’s the ability to efficiently hurt people, to beat up and kill them.

We watch those movies and root for their protagonists, encouraging their violent conducts, cheering for justice. And yet, when *talking* about violence, we “condemn it in the strongest terms.” But what would happen if the protagonist of any action movie couldn’t fight, weren’t willing to, or otherwise failed to act violently when a situation required it? No movie would last more than five minutes, because the hero would always be captured and/or killed in the first scene.

That’s one way to right wrongs: *physically*.

Another way to do justice is to kidnap or arrest people, depriving them of their freedom to come and go. We may also insult or otherwise humiliate someone who has wronged us, disrespecting their dignity; steal from them, violating their property; force them to *do* something, potentially violating all their rights at once; and we can stop people from committing suicide or practicing euthanasia, denying them death so that they must continue to suffer.

Violence is a *tool*; nothing else. It doesn’t make choices or picks sides, and it can equally be used for good or evil. The question is when and how to use it, not *if* we should. And *when* to use violence is a matter of justice, while *how* to do justice is a matter of violence – they are two sides of the same coin.

To use violence against someone who’s innocent is a crime, and violence is the only means we have available to punish those who commit it. That sounds both redundant and obvious at the same time,

but someone must say this nonetheless because, since our politicians keep constantly condemning violence itself – again: so that people don’t misuse it or, above all, use it against *them* – we must make an opposite effort to remind ourselves that that’s not true at all.

Violence is not only strictly necessary but in fact a *good* thing, so long as it’s properly used. Its only problem is that it must be used wisely, and we are not wise enough to use it.

[Don’t] Be Quiet!

Censorship comes to mind after talking about justice and violence, being worth mentioning due to its uniqueness: it is a form of violence, but one that *cannot* be used to do justice.

Let’s start with freedom of speech itself, because it is a weird... thing.

None of us *needs* to speak to live. Speaking out loud, by itself, doesn’t directly make the speaker’s life better in any way. Unlike our fundamental rights, the freedom to share our thoughts and opinions is non-egocentric – it affects *others* rather than ourselves. And the only species we know that can communicate complex abstract notions is the human being. So, despite what I’ve said earlier about there being no human rights, freedom of speech *may* actually qualify as one (privacy might as well but, since it is directly related to personal safety and an ampler sense of freedom, I personally consider it a natural right of all living species – any being that *desires* privacy is automatically entitled to it).

Unlike ants, bees and some other animals, human beings, strictly speaking, can live just fine without speech. In an ant colony, the queen needs other ants to feed her, these ones need each other to be able to find food, and they need the queen herself to reproduce. Honeybees have specialized roles as well, and they can’t survive individually (solitary bees can). But humans can survive on their own, feeding ourselves, building a shelter, and even reproducing in silence or through force (raping). Talking, for us, is a means to *facilitate* our existence, not to guarantee it.

So *what* is freedom of speech? Is it a fundamental right? No, because to many species, including our own, communicating is not strictly

necessary. Is it a human right? It can't be, because exchanging information with others is far more important to other animals than to us. Every living being, without exception, needs to eat, and yet "feeding oneself" is not considered a right of any kind, so why is freedom of speech one? I'm not sure but, since I don't want to be silenced or censored, I feel entitled to share my thoughts. This soliloquy may sound irrelevant to some, but it isn't, because violating any *fundamental* right is axiomatically a crime and, if freedom of speech isn't actually one, it shouldn't have the same protection. But... shouldn't it?

It seems freedom of speech doesn't quite fit with everything else. It must be protected *almost* as strongly as our fundamental rights, but not quite as much and for different reasons. It is a "secondary right," one that sits alone between our natural ones and the rest of our laws. And I said it must be "almost" as strongly protected as our fundamental rights because there is a reason to eventually violate it *preemptively*.

Since freedom of speech is non-egocentric, affecting others rather than ourselves, curtailing it has the same effect. That means censorship cannot be used as a punishment, because instead of harming the silenced person it harms everyone else by rendering the rest of us oblivious to what the one who was censored had to say.

Usually, we censor people for two reasons: one is because they disagree with us and we want our view to be adopted, our ideals to spread and our will to be done instead of theirs; and the other reason is to bar everyone else from becoming aware of something the silenced person knows, of something that can potentially be harmful to the censor, his employers, or those otherwise close to him. But censorship can also be fairly used, in cases that are a variation of that second one: when it is used to bar everyone else from becoming aware of something the silenced person knows, but something that can potentially be *harmful to all*. In other words, the valid, constructive purpose of censorship is *to stop memes from spreading*.

Take the "moon-landing hoax" meme as an example. We did land on the moon, we can do it again if we want and, on its own, this fact implies we ought to be able to do even more, to be bolder and go farther. Simply *knowing* about this can encourage people to study engineering, physics and astronomy, which can lead to one such person figuring out a more efficient propulsion method than combustion or how to efficiently terraform an inhospitable planet to create a new home for mankind. But then some lunatic decided to

ignore all reason and evidence and insist that the moon landing was forged. That person started misrepresenting facts and composing lies to justify their surreal belief, and then began sharing those fantasies with others who, due to a lack of discernment, fell for it. A new group of disillusioned negationists was formed, and they started calling *others* insane for disagreeing with them, antagonizing people who were in the right and pestering governments to reveal supposedly hidden facts that don't actually exist. If such a lie spreads, those who believe in it may end up deciding to study bartending instead of rocket science, which in turn may lead to us never managing to colonize another planet or leave the solar system due to a lack of people qualified to tackle such complex endeavors.

Political ideologies can also be considered memes. Any that doesn't lead to *the* ideal outcome is, in fact, one. Democracy is an example of that, since by denying both reason and the human nature it causes massive damage to all who are subordinated to it. In principle, this makes censoring any spreading democratic ideas the right thing to do. But what if a second ideology that is protected by censoring democratic notions is not ideal either? What if it is even *worse* than democracy? Then we have a problem.

In principle, we should never violate anyone's freedom of speech. But if we take human flaws into account doing so becomes reasonable because, while most of us lack common sense, censorship is the only tool we have available to stop harmful ideas from spreading. If we don't use it, people will keep creating new lies and fantasies and others will keep believing in them. The number of those who believe in things that do not match reality as it is and who act upon such beliefs will keep increasing, and so will the harm they inevitably cause to everyone else.

Censoring those who *deliberately* spread lies to manipulate others is a non-issue, a no-brainer. But most of the memes we infect ourselves with are spread by people who honestly believe what they are saying. They are meant to cause good, but cause harm instead – they are *accidental*. For instance, I could be the one disseminating lies right now, by claiming earlier that we did land on the moon. I wasn't there, so how could I know for sure? I can't – I just strongly believe it, based on the evidence I have. There *is* a tiny chance that I am wrong about that and, if we indeed never landed on the moon, despite my best intentions I would be the one currently misleading others. So we must be very careful when silencing others, because

none of us knows everything, we are not always right, and those who disagree with us are not always wrong.

In practical terms, I believe we should all strive to make it clear when we are not entirely certain of something whenever we share information or ideas with others. And unless we have solid, undeniable proof that those who disagree with us are wrong, we should never censor them. In any minimally uncertain scenario, we must let everyone speak their minds freely.

Freedom of speech becomes a problem when people create lies or state dubious opinions as if they were facts, deliberately misleading others, in which case they must be censored. And censorship becomes a problem when actual facts or reasonable opinions clearly proffered as such get censored, blinding people to the truth or silencing those who simply disagree with the censor.

I think the bottom line is: we must be careful when appointing our censors. We should never let idiots or people with a selfish personal agenda act as such.

Alas, the virtual world is ruled by the first and the real one by the second.

To Arms!

Let me state this upfront and outright: everyone should own a gun (except criminals. And the retarded. And the insane. And children. And junkies. And communists).

Anyone who doesn't own a firearm has no means to defend themselves – above all, against the *state*. They have no means to force those in power to listen to them, no means to stop their government from promulgating unconstitutional laws, no means to deal with corrupt police officers, judges, or any other armed or high-ranking public servant.

Being armed, one can simply go out and shoot any member of the government who violates their rights, but this isn't the point. My point is that if a government ever leans too far to the left or right, and it finally decides to annihilate any and all order or to drastically curtail its population's rights, without weapons no one can do

anything to stop it. When extreme measures start to be officially adopted, owning firearms is the *only* way people have to defend themselves against a tyrannical state, against an oppressive police force, against corrupt public servants, against the mafia running and ruining a country. At the same time, if a population is unarmed, the odds of it being abused by its government increase exponentially, because then this one has nothing to *fear* from those it's supposed to serve and protect, meaning it can freely refuse to do both.

Let's address the essence of things. There's only one kind of power in this world: the power to *hurt*; the power to physically, mentally or emotionally harm others, to cause them pain or take their freedoms and pleasures away.

A government only gets to rule a country because they control the armed and police forces. By keeping all weapons to itself and being completely above the law, those who comprise the government can do *whatever* they want to the rest of us. If we take the police's and the military's guns away they both cease to exist, and by extension so does the government itself, because then no one is compelled to heed it.

Since pain is the only thing people fear, and fear is the only thing people respect, for *us* to be heeded we need to be able to inflict it upon any and all members of the government as well.

To use my own country as an example once again: more than half a century ago, our socialist government built an entire city in the middle of nowhere, as far away as possible from any population center. Safely isolated from the rest of the world, a haven for crooks was erected from the ground up exclusively to house our politicians and supreme court judges. That became and still remains my country's capital. The way I see it, there's only one possible reason for the people in charge of a nation to do something like that: if they plan to do something that will make everyone else want to *kill* them. And ever since that modern-day Sodoma was erected, those who occupy it have been acting as the perverted psychopaths they are, doing everything they can to destroy my country while remaining safely away from all who want to stop them.

In the early two-thousands, soon after the candidate of one of the local communist parties got elected as our president, the government spent heavily on a campaign to disarm the population. It was one of the very first things "the man" (as Obama called him) did.

And many people willingly (read “naively”) handed their firearms over.

Since the Commie’s first mandate, our Constitution has been consistently and completely ignored by the Legislative and the Executive, and publicly ripped to shreds by our Supreme Court countless times. In fact, we now have an inquisitorial tribunal instead of a Supreme Court, as its members simply decided they are free to accuse, persecute, arrest, sue, judge and sentence anyone, for any reason, on their own and at will. The Communist and his goons set my country’s economy, which was booming when they rose to power, on a downward spiral. Most of the stupidest portion of our population – our “Northeasterns;” the equivalent to an American’s “hillbilly” – has been bought by them and now live exclusively on social benefits, not studying, working or ever attempting to do either, reproducing like cockroaches to get even more free money (they are paid per child they have), and they get to elect about 50% of our representatives (even though they are only 25% of the population), having been directly responsible for putting the communists in charge of our country and, from now on, guaranteed to maintain them there until everyone living here either starves to death or flees elsewhere.

Our left-wing government made life harder for any entrepreneur and scared all international investors away. At its helm, our president stole so much money for himself, his family, his friends and his party, as well as to buy other politicians, that he took three of the biggest companies (public or mixed-economy ones) in the country to the brink of bankruptcy (including one that has a *legal monopoly* on local oil extraction and refining). He gave billions of dollars of our taxpayers’ money to neighboring socialist countries, was praised by socialists everywhere, was found guilty of multiple crimes by every judicial branch existent in my country, got sent to jail, was illegally forgiven and released a couple of years later by our rotten Supreme Court (which *had* previously condemned him, but then had a mysterious “change of heart” a little while later) and was then re-elected as our president for a *third* mandate (thanks to our “beloved” Northeasterns). And what was one of the very first things he did upon being re-elected? He blocked the issuance of weapon permits, which the “decent” (incompetent but well-intentioned) president we managed to wedge in between the Commie’s mandates had done everything he could to facilitate.

“Luckily,” we are a “democracy,” and it doesn’t look like these latest four years will be enough for the Commie to achieve his intended “Venezuelation” of my country, because some of our legislators, mayors, governors, and part of our armed forces still offer a *little* resistance. It’s practically guaranteed he’ll be re-elected yet another time though, and he already owns the Supreme Court as well as about half of our Congress (all, again, thanks to the 50% votes from the most useless 25% of our population), being just a couple of steps away from being completely free to destroy and kill whatever and whoever he wants. And when that time comes – which it will, soon or even sooner, at his hands or one of his accomplices’ – we won’t be able to do anything, because we are all unarmed.

If this were the US, some random guy would have shot our felon president dead a *long* time ago, before 10% of the damage he has caused had been done, single-handedly saving more than two hundred million lives. Alas, this isn’t the States.

As another historical argument: several years ago, here, the whole police force of an entire state decided to go on strike (which is forbidden by our Constitution, which is now effectively worthless). Hundreds, if not thousands of people were killed in the wave of violence that followed. And, of course, *nothing* happened to a single policeman. As a consequence, two other similar strikes took place in the following twelve months or so, when even more people were murdered and, once again, no one was punished for it.

If those responsible for leading a country are criminals, there are no morals. If those responsible for defending the Constitution and/or enforcing the law ignore them, we have no rights. If the only ones allowed to walk around with guns are unbound by any moral or legal code, the rest of us are slaves.

Once we have no means to *violently* defend our rights, for all effects and purposes we have none. So if you live in a country where you are allowed to own firearms, never let go of that right. *Ever*. If someone tries to take it from you, shoot them. Literally. And aim for the head.

If you let yourself be disarmed, the next time some greedy politicians decide you are “too free,” you will be forced to agree. At gunpoint.

After I had already written all of the above, Russia invaded Ukraine. This led me to watch *Winter on Fire* – a documentary about the Ukrainians’ protests and resistance against a president they elected

under the promise of integrating their country into the European Union but who turned out to be yet another one of Putin's undercover puppets.

(As a side note: while studying documents from the bygone Soviet Union, Czech archivists accidentally found proof that the KGB *founded* one of my country's major communist parties [needless to say, one of our criminal president's closest allies] and directly controlled it. The FSB most likely still does, to this day.)

In 2013/2014, after their president suddenly turned around and refused to sign a deal that would allow Ukraine to initiate its ascent into the European Union, thousands of Ukrainians spent three consecutive months living and protesting in a symbolic area of Kyiv against his betrayal. They refused to leave until the Russian puppet was removed from office, even after hundreds were brutally attacked by the police and some murdered in cold blood by it in the middle of the streets.

By the end, after three months of protests and countless cowardly beatings, just a few hours after one man from the military took the microphone out of "the opposition's leader" in the middle of a speech and threatened to pick up arms against the government for ignoring the population's will, the Ukrainian president fled the country – in the middle of the night and, of course, straight to Russia.

About two years later, Crimea was invaded and illegally annexed by Putin. Eight years further down the road, he invaded Ukraine again, this time with the intent of taking over the entire country. But I'm saying all of this because of one particular detail from that documentary: after the police started attacking the Ukrainian protesters, these started wearing helmets to protect themselves. Just a few *days* later, a law was passed by their utterly corrupt Congress prohibiting people from, among other things, wearing headcovers. It literally said something in the lines of "wearing anything on one's head with the purpose of protecting it is a crime."

One day after that law was passed, every single protester had something on their heads to protect themselves, as they obviously should.

This concrete scenario is a very clear example of how a corrupt state bent on slaving its people doesn't want these to be able to protect themselves. It's not hard to imagine, then, what a government's thoughts are on its population *fighting back*.

Even in a democracy, despite popular belief, people hold no power whatsoever. We are *fooled* into believing we do. We are told peaceful protests can make a difference. Perhaps they can, a little, but only when it *doesn't matter*. The truth is any government is entirely free to ignore its population when people have no means to violently threaten those in power, to fend off and overwhelm the police. Thus, whenever we are unarmed, our leaders ignore us.

I reiterate, then, that all civilians other than the children, the insane, the retarded, former convicts and communists (as these are openly in favor of stealing what belongs to others) *must* own firearms. This approach comes with some problems of its own, especially (if not “exclusively”) when applied to populations with lower IQ and/or education, but it’s *far* preferable to general disarmament.

In a human world, if you have no guns you have no freedom. It is as simple as that.

Miseducation

Unsurprisingly, our educational system is as flawed and ineffective as all others.

Schools seem to exist mainly to keep children away from their parents (because these ones can’t stand them) and from society (so they don’t get hurt or pester other people), rather than to *teach* them something (because 99% of what we learn in school is useless). They are 95% daycare, 5% learning institution.

As far as I can tell, and taking reading, writing and basic math aside, I never used a single thing I learned in school in my entire life – not *one*. I have literally forgotten how to add and subtract on paper because, after graduating from high school, I’ve only ever done calculations in my head or using a calculator. I spent nearly two decades withering away in a wooden chair for four or five hours a day, five days a week, for nothing. And so did you, and pretty much everyone else.

True story: I recently heard someone mentioning “social studies” on the TV and that reminded me I studied that, in school, for years. I had honestly and completely forgotten I ever even *had* those classes.

Since throughout our early ages our brains are still being built, schools should aim to improve children’s *intellectual capabilities*, and not to make them memorize raw, useless information. They should help kids understand the basic, general guidelines of how our universe, our planet, our species and our society works, not teach them specific things that are boring, make no sense to a young, underdeveloped mind and have no use for the vast majority of people, like trigonometry or syntax analysis. *College* is the institution meant to teach things that only a handful of us needs or wants to know.

Instead of forcing a bunch of uninteresting data into the minds of children who can’t imagine a single purpose for any of it, we should develop how they think because our first years comprise the only period in a human’s life when this can be done with profound and long-lasting consequences. Improving a child’s cognitive functions will affect everything they do for the rest of their lives, and it can be done in far less boring and much more effective ways than the ones we have been using, in ways that might encourage them to keep learning rather than making them hate to do so.

As far as raw information goes, children and teenagers only need to be made aware of our world as it *is* and of what *can* be done in it. They just need to understand what is possible, what isn’t, and how everything is directly connected to everything else. They should acquire a general comprehension of what our species has already discovered and of what it still hasn’t. And they must be taught to think ahead, not to reminisce about the distant, long dead and useless past. (We don’t need any lessons from history – being *smarter* and more *well-informed* than our ancestors is the proper way to avoid repeating their mistakes).

Upon acquiring a general view of the human existence, of our planet’s and our universe’s workings and potentials, children can automatically find out what they are drawn to and choose what they want to focus on, discovering their own talents and interests. *Forcing* anything upon them is a waste of their precious time and limited memories. They don’t need to be dumbed down and shunned away from learning by being obligated to deal with things that, to them, are as incomprehensible as they are irrelevant.

Another thing about education is that most teachers are now *obsolete*. Essentially, we only need a handful of them in the entire planet.

Thanks to high-speed internet, we can now call in our top experts on each field, ask them to record their knowledge in a didactic manner, pay them a fair amount of money (*fair*, and not “a lot,” because teaching requires very little effort – learning is the hard part) and it’s done. Then, anyone should be allowed to access those lessons and learn whatever they can from them.

The principle, here, is extremely simple and plainly obvious: a *single person can teach billions*.

There’s no valid reason left for anyone to go to school, to be physically present in classes. This archaic mentality and behavior leads to an enormous amount of time, effort and resources being wasted just to achieve a much worse result, as in any single institution a student has direct physical access to they will be taught by teachers much inferior to the best in the country, or in the world.

On top of that, the “universal teacher method” allows for every student (except those without internet access) on the planet to receive the exact same lessons, being perfectly fair (though in practice this would be divided by country, since nations don’t want *other* populations to become smarter or more knowledgeable than their own). This method is much cheaper, easier, faster and fairer, it saves us a lot of natural resources, and it also spares every student a lot of precious time. Downsides it has none.

There’s no reason to stick to the old ways, but we still do. We stick to it because teachers must eat and, most importantly, because they *vote*. There’s no other excuse – for a political and economic one, we torture our children, ruin their youth, destroy their brains, waste resources, create traffic jams, warm the planet further and keep our entire species ignorant and misinformed, jeopardizing our future while also tying the learning opportunities each person has to the location they were born in and to their financial status.

Some college buildings and specific teachers should remain in place and continue to provide presential lessons as they always have because certain advanced courses require physical infrastructures as well as practical experimenting and/or direct supervision.

Elementary and high schools should be demolished and every strictly theoretical teacher should be fired and replaced by expert-made, freely available internet-streamed classes.

We must allow the human race to take this leap forward, because it's one of the very few that we can, very easily, take right now.

The large number of to-be unemployed teachers will just have to try to find an actual *use* for what they've been teaching. (Best of luck to them, for that'll be a difficult endeavor.)

Together or Apart

A population can be deliberately united or divided depending on its government's goals, and both things are achieved the same way: via brainwashing.

To unite a nation, governments brainwash people into becoming *patriots*, and the United States is, notoriously, the best example of how this is done. Americans are forced to listen to their *national anthem* every day, often more than once. Any sports match played in the US is preceded by the American anthem. Someone is about to give a speech? They play it beforehand. Someone died? They play it respectfully. Someone was born? They play it to celebrate. Classes are about to start? They play it in the schoolyard. A new day dawned in the barracks? They play it on speakers. Someone is driving to work? It's playing on the radio. One is trying to sleep? It's playing on the neighbor's TV.

Not only in the United States, but everywhere, people are instructed to stand still and in silence, with a hand laid over their hearts (or rather misplaced over their chests) when listening to their country's anthem. And when we see many other people doing that, it gives us the impression of a *solemn rite*. It gives us the impression – and nothing more – that the national anthem somehow matters, that it truly means something, and that it must be respected. And as we stand amid hundreds or thousands of others listening to an annoying, archaic song in silence, or singing along with it, none of us can tell whether *any* of the others present is taking part in the ritual due to actually respecting the anthem and what it supposedly represents;

simply because they were taught, since birth, to do so; or out of fear – the fear of being attacked by everyone else in case they refuse to join the rite, to sing the anthem, or to at least remain silent while it plays.

Forcing the national anthem upon people is one way to manipulate them, creating a self-enforcing vicious circle that leads to the general impression that a country is not just an abstract concept, but rather something real with a concrete and enormous value. Patriots are born when people truly start believing that their nation must be protected and preserved at all costs, above anything else.

Flags are also a ritualistic symbol used to represent what a nation pretends to be, and the Americans idolize theirs just as fervently as they do their national anthem. The hilliest of their Billys hang not just one, but two star-spangled banners over their porches to showcase their “love” for their country, regardless of how much they hate most of the people who comprise it. Me, I wouldn’t think twice before wiping myself with my country’s flag if I ran out of toilet paper but, to an American, that would be sacrilege. And that’s simply because they were taught and implicitly threatened to think so.

Patriotic symbols and the rituals built around them are a form of worship – of the abstract country itself and, by extension and much more dangerously, of those who govern it.

Propaganda is also used, and the United States’ spreads far and wide, mainly via Hollywood movies. These send the message, across the entire globe, that Americans are the best, that they are inexorably right, never fail, always know what they are doing, and that they do literally everything better than anyone else. None of those things are true, of course – Nordic countries enjoy the best quality of life; Canadians are the most civilized people; Asians are the smartest; the US has waged and been defeated in multiple asymmetric (always in their favor) wars; the American government lies, disregards international treaties, finances and supports genocide; and it took them almost a decade to find Bin Laden and, out of the two helicopters they sent filled with marines to assassinate him, one crashed right upon landing.

(Just to throw it out there: it’s amusing that the American people elected, re-elected and, years later, still praise Barack *Hussein Obama* – a guy pretty much named after two historical enemies of the United States [Saddam and Bin Laden].)

Despite the United States' numerous historical failures and its people's humane flaws, in every Hollywood production American soldiers are worth anything between a hundred and a million of their enemies'. A single Rambo can defeat Russia, one Jason Bourne can defeat the United States' own CIA, and a Braddock can defeat both Rambo and Bourne at once, from twelve miles away, with his fists, while asleep. According to Hollywood, American experts are the best in the entire planet, their scientists are the smartest, and "the world" *means* "the United States" (they seem to be oblivious to the fact that they are less than 5% of humanity).

When people constantly receive the same message, it sticks to them. And those born in the US, as they start truly believing in what they keep telling themselves, try to act as that "idealized American," as the kind of people their own propaganda encourages them to be. Though that has the downside of making them arrogant, the fact that they at least *try* to be better does make them better than they would otherwise be. And when hundreds of millions of people keep trying, a handful of them eventually succeed.

Thanking people for their military service is another brainwashing device used in "America" (in a part of its northern half). Since I'm not American, I wasn't there when this modern tradition was born and, consequently, I can't say for sure how it started. But if I were to guess, I'd assume the United States' government had a finger (not to say a whole arm) in initiating it.

As time passed, "thank you for your service" seems to have substituted the classic "'sup, bro" when an American civilian meets any person who ever worked for their military (even though less than 15% of these ever see any actual combat). And by now, many probably feel *obligated* to say that, while some in the military might even be offended if they don't hear those words – the symptoms of a self-enforcing, fear-based vicious circle being formed.

That public overappreciation of military service is meant to make the American population blindly support their armed forces in spite of Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq, Guantanamo Bay, D-Day's Omaha beach assault, the "terrorist" attacks they've suffered in retaliation for financing and supplying the slaughter/genocide of Arabs on the other side of the planet, and God knows how many more blunders their government and armed forces have committed (and omitted). The "thank you for your service" slogan aims to manipulate Americans into giving their military carte blanche; it's meant to make all

American citizens fear criticizing their military, so that their government can freely use its weapons to achieve any end it desires, however immoral and violent it may be and regardless of whether they are in the United States' general population's best interests or not.

In case you think I'm exaggerating, I remind you of a scene from the movie *Vice* (about Dick Cheney, Bush's VP) in which they put together a focus group, find out the expression "global warming" has a much more negative impact on people's minds than "climate change" and, thus, decide to make this second expression the official one, for political goals. The movie claims to be based on real facts, and I personally remember noticing it when the media suddenly switched from "global warming" to "climate change" because it was blatantly manipulative and clearly deliberate. Now, this second expression has long become the rule - even though both of them mean the exact same thing and the first one is far more accurate - exclusively because American Dicky wanted to fool people into believing the potential annihilation of the entire human race, for which the United States would/will be one of the major contributors, is no big deal. So, yes - the US government *does* manipulate their own people, as it does all others. Routinely.

The purpose of the American mixed-economy propaganda machine is to make as many people as possible believe Americans are flawless, infallible and unbeatable. It is to make its own people believe that patriotism is "a thing" and to make them support any and all of its government's endeavors, making the nation easy to herd and steer. And it also serves to make the rest of the world afraid of their military, and consequently "respectful" of their wishes. It's all just traditional propaganda, as perfected by the Nazis. But the funny thing is that Russia, having something like 5% of the US's wealth, does that last trick (making the world afraid of it) *better*, using much more conventional and cheaper means: they just directly threaten people with words. And then they *fulfill* those threats - which the US, UK and EU never do, unless it's against an extremely weak and utterly defenseless country or people.

If you are American, don't get me wrong: none of what I just said was meant to be offensive. Part of the reality you live in is completely made up, but none of us, anywhere on the planet, deals with actual reality. And this isn't necessarily a bad thing. The patriotic brainwashing you suffered throughout your entire life serves a purpose and has some positive consequences, which is why they do it

to you (in part). Making people believe a country is united *has* the effect of uniting it, just as making people believe a country is worth dying for *has* the effect of conjuring up volunteers to sacrifice their lives to defend it.

If people are unpatriotic and their country is invaded, they'll be much easier to defeat, because no one will be willing to fight for it. Even those in the military, who are paid to do so, will be much more likely to rout and surrender, since soldiers don't *want* to die any more than the rest of us do. Thus, brainwashing the population is actually very important to protect a country's territorial integrity, and to maintain its sovereignty as well as its people's culture and their way of life (even though it directly interferes with these).

General/public perception is a mind game, and brainwashing *is* the way to play it. Though people can be manipulated via solemn rituals, gaslighting, subliminal messaging and other assorted means, it all amounts to "brainwashing" because the goal is always the same: to make millions or billions of people believe in a lie or fantasy, ultimately causing them to do one (or a few) man's bidding. Whether that's done for the greater *benefit* or *detriment* of all is the actual crux of the matter.

In North Korea they do the exact same thing as in the US, but upside-down - they brainwash their entire population into hating Americans. In Russia, they manipulate their population so hard that many Russians actually believe they live in a good country (or maybe that's just me being wrong, having been manipulated by American/Western propaganda myself).

That's why we must always keep an eye open: to see when, how, and in which direction we are being fooled and herded, because those doing the brainwashing can just as easily sway us in one direction as they can in any other.

To tear a nation *apart*, instead of encouraging patriotism governments sow division and conflict among their own people. And the form of brainwashing they use for this is called "populism."

"Populism" essentially means "to find an enemy for the masses while making sure that this enemy is *never* the state." As a rule, that enemy is "the elite" - governments pit the poor against their bosses or anyone else who's more successful than them. People who belong

to any “underprivileged” group are convinced by populist politicians (with the bribed or coerced media’s help) that those who are doing well are doing so at *their expense*; that what “the privileged elite” has was stolen from them; that everything that went and still goes wrong in their lives is the elite’s fault.

The clever part of the populists’ scheme is that their arguments are not entirely false, and most people aren’t smart enough to figure out which parts of the stories they are told are true and which aren’t – we tend to believe everything we hear, or none of it. That “the elite” is to blame is partially true because the greediest capitalists *are* to blame for a large part of everyone else’s misery, since they do steal from all of us. But most of that misery is caused by the other and much more terrible part of “the elite:” the government itself. And populism comes into play precisely when this fact becomes self-evident to too many members of the population.

When too many fingers point at the government and this one is unwilling to change its ways (because the harm it has been causing is deliberate and the personal profits its members aimed for are still flowing in), it *deflects* them to someone else. They say “the elite is to blame!” while constantly swearing by their own lives and everyone else’s that they are not a part of it. This, in turn, causes the most ignorant folks – which, I repeat, are always the majority of any population – to become angry at people *other* than those who they should be angry at. The mob then declares war against the tiny minority that comprises the *financial* elite and, ignorantly, also against millions of others who aren’t a part of it and who have nothing to do with the issue at hand: the *middle-class*. Then we have half the population fighting the other half (the poor versus anyone who is not as poor as them), which is the populists’ desired goal.

Populism can easily be extended beyond the financially “privileged/underprivileged.” After instigating the working Joe to murder the nearest McDonald’s franchise owner, populists start pitting the uneducated against the educated; socialists against capitalists; women against men; homosexuals against heterosexuals; black against white. And if none of that suffices, a whole country against another.

The important thing, especially for a *failed state* (using the term loosely), is that there must always be an enemy for the masses. There must always be some conflict distracting the population from the state’s mismanagement and misdeeds. Something must keep

people away from the true source of their misery, allowing those who are truly to blame to keep profiting from the common man's suffering. Someone *else* must always take the blame for a state's faults, and the more mismanaged a country is, the bigger the conflict it engenders to protect itself (or rather the very people who comprise the government) must be.

If, despite populists' best efforts, things go too far or not far enough – if people start killing each other too often on the streets, or if they don't do so often enough – the words “government” or “president” keep showing up too frequently in heated debates and angry speeches, and violent protests emerge every now and then, a *war* is then declared against another country, with a forged *casus belli* and the sole intent of rallying the population behind the very people who stole from them and ruined their lives. Millions of people are forced to murder each other, the whole global economy is shaken, millions of tons of metal are wasted and tens of millions more of CO² thrown into the atmosphere, and the entire world's near future (if not all of it) may be compromised so that *one* man and his trusted cabal can remain in power and continue to abuse it in their own favor. There are even a couple of technical terms for people who are willing to go this far, who actually adopt those tactics, leading to such ends: they are known as “Putins,” “Netanyahus” or “Trumps.”

Starting an external war is the last resort and also a very risky gamble. If the troublesome, attacking country is defeated, its Putin's life is over and the vast fortune he stole won't be able to afford him even one more private-jet trip to anywhere but a piss-soaked grave under a spit-covered, graffitied tombstone. So, as a rule, states led by populists seek *infighting*. The more of it they create, the more segregated and weaker a society becomes, as then it can no longer focus towards *any* goal since its people are distracted battling each other. The society in question becomes unable to amass enough power to police the government, and those in power can do literally anything they want.

Once populists manage to make their people start to literally kill each other, the road is paved and flat for them to enact a long sequence of authoritarian measures using that very fact as an excuse – “People have gone mad! Our cities and states have lost control! The federal government needs *more power* to re-establish order!”

And that's how hundreds of millions of people end up being enslaved at once.

Brainwashing is a tool that can be, and in fact is used, all the time, to achieve different goals. Out of these, the two most important ones are to incite patriotism or populism, respectively uniting or dividing a nation, strengthening or weakening it, potentially bringing out the best or worst in people. But even if applied in our favor, brainwashing is always used *against our will*, covertly behind our backs instead of openly in our faces.

If you pay a little attention, it's not hard to tell when governments and other institutions are trying to manipulate you. One of the most popular methods is to force new words or expressions into people's mouths: politicians repeat them as often as possible (much more often than necessary) to cause the general public to do the same. As we keep hearing those words and expressions all the time, every day, everywhere, they immediately come to our minds when any scenario *minimally* related to the circumstances in which they are so often uttered arises. People start repeating those exact same words out loud, often as a joke, never really knowing why, making a point they don't understand for reasons they don't know, and those who *hear* it automatically think, "There's one more who believes in that. I seem to be vastly outnumbered. So I'd better stay quiet despite how absurd what they're saying is."

"Climate changes" (actual "global warming"), "democracy," "racism," "antisemitism" and "terrorist" are all examples of the above – they are all words and expressions used *incessantly* by public figures to steer us away from the path of reason, to reassign blame and to limit our freedom, so that we can't stand in their way and hinder their personal agendas.

Whenever you hear politically- or financially-motivated people repeating the exact same word(s) over and over again, rest assured: you are being *played*. They want you to believe in and fear contradicting whatever they say, without ever telling you why (because they know you wouldn't like it).

Nationalism

Thanks to the mismanagement of immigrants and to nonsensical DEI policies, several European countries, as well as the United States, are now going through a nationalist phase. Right-wing parties have been garnering more and more votes all over Europe, Trump is once again leading the US, Órban is in charge of Hungary, the People's Party of Estonia elected its first parliament members in 2015, the Finns Party almost won 2019's elections in Finland, Le Penn is quite popular in France, etc.

Western politics went way too far to the left. While adopting a more self-centered and conservative posture is necessary to fix the harm caused by that, the Americans and Europeans are doing so in [justified] *anger*, at least in part seeking revenge for what the socialists and liberals have done to them. Revenge is just, so that's fine. But the anger is a problem, because it will lead people to take things just as far to the right as they previously did to the left. And it's the *going too far*, regardless of in which direction, that is harmful and can even potentially lead to a country's, or a supranational union's, demise.

Just like barring undesirable immigrants is necessary, so is allowing the desirable ones inside. The United States' technological supremacy, as an example, was fundamentally forged by German scientists, not by American ones. Had those scientist migrants not been welcomed into the US, the Soviet Union would most likely have won the Space Race. Germany would also have been the first country to develop nuclear weapons and to amass a gigantic nuclear arsenal, and how they handled this power would have led to a completely different geopolitical configuration of our planet.

Nationalists are right in fighting the last decades' immigration trend, as well as a whole lot of other misguided social and liberal policies. But the West will lose its hegemony if it *completely* shuts its doors to outsiders, and especially if it does so to those who, albeit being foreigners, are nonetheless Westerners. I'm talking about generating attrition and severing ties between the US and Europe, or between European countries themselves. Together, those countries have all thrived, but if the United States tries to fend off the entire planet on its own, or if individual European countries try to survive alone, none of them will manage to. And that's because the European people and their descendants have wronged and irked pretty much the rest of the entire planet in the past century or two; because natural resources are randomly scattered across the globe and no country has direct access to everything it needs; because the most brilliant

minds can appear anywhere and they mostly tend to show up in Asia; and because without both resources *and* brilliance no one can go much farther past where we are now.

In the UK, nationalists caused the Brexit, segregating the United Kingdom from the rest of the European Union. And those who paid the most for it were the British themselves, due to losing access to Europe's qualified labor force, complicating the transit of goods between the UK and the rest of the continent, increasing red tape, lowering exports, losing foreign investments, etc. The United Kingdom's intention was to have more autonomy to deal with the rest of the world according to its own will, without subjecting itself to the European Union's rules and bureaucracy, but however reasonable that goal was, pursuing it backfired.

European countries currently with a nationalist at the helm have already ceased providing Ukraine with aid in its defensive war against Russia. As expected, the United States immediately did the same once Trump was re-elected. Such leaders focus exclusively on their own peoples, turning all their attention to within the geographical boundaries of their countries. They adopt a narrow-sighted perspective, ignoring the fact that they are each just a small part of a big planet, cutting ties with the rest of it, becoming isolated, and potentially rendering themselves oblivious to external threats. But simply wanting to and believing you can thrive on your own doesn't mean you actually can.

Órban and Fico both "forget" that if Ukraine loses the war, their own countries are among the first ones in line to be invaded next by Russia. By focusing solely on Hungary's and Slovakia's internal and immediate needs, they might be leading their countries directly to war while at the same time rendering their nations entirely unprepared for it, practically guaranteeing their own peoples' defeat. And how likely Russia is to invade other European countries - including Hungary and Slovakia - after Ukraine is defeated (which hopefully won't happen) is directly proportional to the preparedness level of those countries because, if Ukraine falls, Russia will automatically have all of its guns pointed at Europe's neck, at point-blank. Who, then, would trust Putin *not* to pull the trigger? What if not skepticism and raw military might could possibly deter him?

Meanwhile, Trump is half a world away from the action and he needs to pay someone to point him Europe's location on a map. He's safe from all danger, so he can fail at trying to MAGA *again* without major concerns. Except that he also "forgets" that, if Russia takes over the

entire European continent, it won't take very long before New York becomes the next Bucha, if not the next Hiroshima. And without Europe, the US wouldn't stand a chance against a ten times richer Russia and China combined. Thus, much like Órban and Fico, Trump might be paving the way to the United States' demise.

Ultra-nationalist countries tend to cut ideological, political, diplomatic and commercial ties with former friends and allies, ending up alone without being able to fend for themselves, having no one left who's willing to aid them when they need it the most.

Isolationism doesn't work. This is just my opinion, of course, but I do believe that, at this day and age, anyone who wants to fare better must learn to play with others.

This nationalist trend is yet another case in which democracy fails us. Being furious with the results of the socialists' policies, people support and vote for the other *extreme* of the political spectrum. Being narrow-sighted, the common man wants quick results in the short-term, ignoring the long-term consequences of his choices just like small children do, gaiting gaily towards their own potentially violent and gruesome end.

Thanks to people pushing too hard for a *few* particular anti-social and anti-liberal measures, *hardcore* nationalists end up getting elected to enact them - people who seek not only to solve those particular problems, but to truly segregate their countries from the rest of the world; people who want to make their country "great again" without having any idea of what that means or how to achieve it. While those pushing for more border control, no unisex toilets in elementary schools, for being allowed to have all of their employees being of the same color, etc., are right, those they elect to enact such changes aren't. It's not what people *want* that might end up ruining their countries and lives - it's what the extremist folks they accidentally end up electing believe in that is likely to do so.

In the present case, democracy fails us because it leads to a particular kind of *unbalance*: people hang all on one side of the scale until it hurtfully hits the ground, then they all move emotionally to the other, causing the same thing to happen again. And then again, and again, as in a silly seesaw. They elect the wrong leaders and then the other wrong leaders, forever unable to find a reasonable and stable middle ground.

Insofar as the upcoming nationalist movement negates the socialists' wrongdoings, it's a good thing and I'm glad it's finally happening. But if it goes too far, like the "politically correct" movement did, it will end up being just as bad, because it can lead to fundamental rights being violated, to freedoms being restricted, to people being treated unfairly and to the eventual dissolution of what little good it took us millions of years to achieve just the same.

Thanks to democracy, the odds are we are going to repeat our recent past mistakes – if not in the same direction, in the opposite one. From the left or the right, from within or without, it seems to me the West is slowly moving toward collapse. It could take twenty years or it could take five hundred, but we are dead set on continuing to do things the wrong way.

Why? Thanks to democracy and how it fails to take human flaws into account.

The Way

As I wrote this text, new thoughts crossed my mind and I have reached new conclusions. Though I couldn't before, I may now be able to suggest, in broad strokes, a tangible, practical path for humanity to pursue.

The following introduction, combined with the suggested steps that ensue, should work as a summary of most of what I've said so far:

Life's purpose is to be enjoyed and, to this end, I believe we should have as our immediate collective goals *to unify our species* and *to improve ourselves*.

We [still] live in suffering. Thanks to our most intelligent minds and the technological advancements they have gifted us all with, we have overcome Earth's natural environment, thirst, hunger and most diseases. Nature was once our greatest enemy; now, it's our greatest ally. Surviving it was our top priority; now, that has become to survive ourselves.

Most of the suffering we still have to endure is caused by us, by one man or woman to another. That happens because of how life

naturally favors selfishness, and because we are still programmed to think and act the same way we did hundreds of thousands, or even millions of years ago. We are egotistical because this *is* the easiest way to survive. We don't care about those we don't know and who have no immediate use to us because we can't feel other people's feelings and, from our individual perspectives, every human being we are not directly connected to is interchangeable and replaceable, if not entirely irrelevant. We destroy anything and anyone so long as doing so brings us any kind of profit. We are guided by emotions instead of reason, despite the [apparently] paradoxical fact that they shouldn't even exist. We care about our individual selves only and not at all about our species as a whole, instinctively ignoring the fact that for any one of us to live a decent life we *all* need to live it, because we are irrevocably bound together.

We must *improve ourselves* for us to finally stop harming each other. We must find a way not to feel pleasure when we do so, we must feel bad for stealing the fruits of someone else's labor, and we must quit ruining millions of lives to enlarge a single bank account. We must cease causing far more suffering than joy. And we must *unify our species* to reduce our disagreements and conflicts to a minimum and, eventually, be able to explore the other 100% of the universe that we are not yet familiar with; to be able to discover, understand, deal with, appreciate and ultimately enjoy everything we don't even know exists.

As long as we see other humans as different from us, we will distrust, dislike and try to destroy them. And that has to change – not the fact that we do that, which is logical and necessary to our survival, but the fact that we *need* to do that. The only way to stop fearing and hating those who are unlike us is for them not to exist (at least not on the same planet as us). Thus we must become one people, globally sharing a single culture and the same genetic pool.

We can't unify our species while being as flawed and insane as we are because, until we are [at least partially] fixed, our own instincts won't allow us to. And if by some miracle we manage to become a single people while still being as stupid, rude, selfish, greedy, irresponsible, incompetent and uncivilized as we are, we'll just keep causing trouble for ourselves. At the same time, we can't become better human beings until there's only one kind of people inhabiting Earth – without this, we'd keep sharing our planet with our enemies, with people with attitudes, habits, traditions and mentalities that are counter-productive and which hinder everyone else's progress,

potentially leading humanity to complete stagnation and eventual extinction. We cannot unleash mankind's full potential while anything good we do benefits people who don't deserve it, while it propagates the lives of those who exist exclusively to harm others, of those who contribute negatively to "humanity's score" and who should never have been alive in the first place.

Thus, improving ourselves and unifying humanity must be worked on *at the same time*, because they are intertwined and we cannot succeed without both of them. And to achieve those objectives, I believe we should adopt the following steps:

Step 1: To rehaul our educational system and openly share our [non-sensitive] knowledge.

As a measure that can easily and cheaply be immediately adopted, as well as a requirement for Step 2 which in turn is required for every other to work, this comes first.

Every person, wherever they are on Earth, should have access to the exact same classes via internet. We should record our most knowledgeable experts sharing what they know and make it available for everyone, anywhere and for free.

All it takes for that to become a reality is for each "global professor" to record their classes *once*. This is not only far better, but also much easier and cheaper than what we currently have in place. Charging for teaching is a steal (since those being taught are the ones doing all the hard lifting), and limiting the access human beings have to lessons based on the location they were born in, in how much money they have, or in the language they speak serves only to hold our entire species back.

In practice, this measure would initially be adopted in a country-by-country basis since no nation wants to share its discoveries with others - doing this would entail a people forfeiting their intellectual and technological hegemony, sharing what they know with friends and enemies alike. *After* some of the next steps I'm about to suggest have been adopted, this first one could then be implemented globally.

Updating our educational system and enabling everyone to learn whatever they want would vastly increase our collective competence, and becoming generally more enlightened should considerably improve our morality as well. On top of that, when

everyone gets the same opportunities no one can plausibly victimize themselves by using the excuse of having no access to a proper education to cover up their own flaws and ineptitudes. Once everyone has the same ease of access to the same top-quality education, people can be *equally judged* based on their achievements. Those who fail, then, in becoming positive additions to mankind will have only themselves to blame. Or rather themselves, their own genes (lack of luck) and their parents (incompetent and irresponsible people who reproduced when they shouldn't have, thus creating a useless human being). But no one else – not random people, our society, our leaders, our chosen policies or humanity as a whole.

That lack of possible excuses for one's failures is helpful, and perhaps even necessary for the next crucial step to be implemented. Otherwise, if Step 2 is ever openly suggested and seriously considered, people will immediately position themselves overwhelmingly against it by saying that they were and continue to be treated unfairly, alleging that their faults are always someone else's and never their own.

Step 2: To drastically reduce the number of humans on Earth while improving our culture and genetic stock at the same time.

This is the most important step we must take. More humans means more social issues, greater damage to Earth, fewer resources available and lower odds of survival for our species and all others with whom we share this planet.

To be properly governed, we need enlightened people not only as our leaders but also *choosing* them, otherwise they'll never get to lead. For people to truly know what they are doing, they need information and education. For them to acquire those, they need intelligence. To have intelligence, people need good genetic material and to be properly raised in a nurturing environment, both of which depend on them having good parents. And for good people to survive, thrive, and decide to become parents, we can't have bad ones around.

While [far] too many vile and/or ignorant folks inhabit our planet, the best among us either refuse to reproduce or have less children than they otherwise would. Meanwhile, the ones who shouldn't

exist do the opposite. That *degrades* our genetic pool and culture as time passes, proliferating people who can't learn and who believe stealing is a valid way to make a living. Humanity then grows stupider and more animalistic, becoming unable to understand how a civilized society should even work, dedicating itself to ruining its own existence instead of improving it (this is where we have been stuck at since we exist). And the worse we become, the worse become the people we choose to lead us, who then move us all farther and farther away from our true goals, eventually making it impossible for us to reach any of them, solidifying humanity's fate as a failed species bound to stagnation followed by extinction.

With undesirable leaders and population both, we cannot progress. With them, we'll *never* be able to create a stable, peaceful and truly thriving society. Those two elements give rise to and enforce each other, but I believe that, due to the fact that we *all* naturally tend to become evil, the second one is the core issue and thus the one that must be directly addressed.

To fix this problem, we should develop a *test* based on thorough criteria, evaluating intellectual, moral, mental, civic, genetic, physical and psychological capacities to identify the best people among us – those who live and act in accordance to how life *has* to be lived so that we might, one day, be able to actually enjoy it. This test should be applied to every human being, without exceptions, and our scores stamped right on our ID cards. People who pass it ought to be allowed to freely reproduce, while those who don't must be prohibited from doing so. Violations of this policy cannot be allowed, meaning that those who refuse to comply and proceed to multiply themselves illegally must be severely penalized, ideally being forced to carry out an abortion. In the worst case scenario, if the child is born, this one ought to be executed alongside its parents.

Since the worst among us are bound to refuse to be sterilized or even to simply refrain from reproducing, some backlash is to be expected, and violence would then have to be used to contain those people, as is its constructive purpose.

Race, gender, sexual orientation, place of birth, financial and social statuses are all irrelevant here. What matters matters, what doesn't doesn't. Though genes and alleles do play an important role in determining what each person becomes, the survival of the

best (as opposite to “the fittest”), by itself, would in time fix our genome. Meanwhile, a reasonable, productive and fulfilling culture can be thought and assimilated by anyone, so long as a person is raised in it.

The intention is for decent human beings to live and multiply, while undesirable ones are to be extinct. There’s no need for the latter to be persecuted or made to suffer in any way (unless *they* make it necessary); only for them not to reproduce.

Ultimately, I’d suggest reducing the human population to about one hundred million people, as that sounds reasonable to me. But we should, of course, do some proper planning and calculations (which I’m not qualified to) before setting a number.

The next steps all depend on this one. Without it, nothing *can* work – sustainability, balance and peace cannot be achieved while humanity remains what it currently is.

Many people would certainly oppose the adoption of this policy but, if Step 1 (updating our educational system) is ever properly implemented, many more of us will become able to see the sense in it. And this should allow our politicians to enact this essential reform, against most people’s instinctive and emotional wills but for everyone’s sake.

Step 3: To deflate the state.

Having completed Step 2 and being left with a much smaller and better population, we would face far less problems than we are used to. States exist to maintain order, to guarantee a nation’s sovereignty, and to protect the fundamental rights of its citizens. Those three things are necessary but, since our countries are always mismanaged and have a tendency to encumber themselves with myriad of unnecessary tasks, what a state ends up mostly doing is to *hinder* progress. Thus, the leaner our bureaucracies are, the better everything is.

By lowering the number of our public servants by as much as possible, bureaucracy and taxes would be drastically reduced, lifting one of the heaviest deadweights we’ve set upon our own shoulders.

Businesses would be easier to start and manage, new ideas could be tried and implemented much faster, production would rise and could be directly tied to demand, everything would be cheaper, we'd all have more free time, and our quality of life would improve accordingly.

Step 4: To arm the entire human population.

With much less, much smarter and much better people roaming Earth, all having free access to the same highest-quality education and to the most accurate information available, the downsides of arming the average human being would become negligible.

With every person owning firearms and being allowed to carry them (excluding the mentally ill, children, and others who just as obviously shouldn't handle guns), the state, already weakened, could finally be kept *under control*.

The police force as we know it should be dismantled, since with decent people wandering around armed, in large numbers and everywhere, it would no longer be necessary – the police's *law-enforcement* role would be fulfilled by the population itself. Any wanted criminal could have their photo, all their personal information and the reasons for the issuance of their arrest warrant made public, and anyone would be entitled to arrest them using any means necessary (or to *protect* them instead, in case the arrest warrant was unjustified).

Investigative and forensic work should still be done by professionals employed by the state, since experts are needed to fulfill such tasks and their reports must be unbiased (with improved morals, corruption should become a minor, much rarer issue). They'd also be in charge of creating and maintaining a public database of criminals and their [alleged] exploits.

These last two paragraphs were a rather simplistic and crude, top-of-my-mind suggestion of how things should be done. I'm sure we could come up with something a little more refined, but there's no point in trying to do so right now, while we are so far away from reaching this point.

With our main police forces extinct, the state would no longer be able to threaten and scare its own citizens at will, which in turn

would finally allow every public servant's salary to be reduced to a fair value (as we could then simply kill whoever abused their position to oppose this reasonable reduction). This would lower taxes further and also increase the amount of well-intentioned people working for the state, as now those who entered the public service would no longer be encouraged to do so due to financial ambitions, leaving such positions open for people with a legitimate civic intent.

For the first time in history, governments would serve the population instead of the other way around. And without a police force, one of our collective wealth's sinkholes would be shut closed; our worst criminals would no longer be disguised as the law nor be above it; and the first of humanity's two most dreadful tools of oppression would be eradicated.

Step 5: To implement *actual* justice.

Since only the victim of a crime truly knows how much they've suffered due to what was done to them, they are the only one qualified to sentence those who violated their rights.

The state should intervene just to make sure the criminal *can* be identified (by surveying public locations with cameras, having forensic teams available, conducting necessary investigations, etc.) and that they are identified *accurately*. And judges should exist exclusively to guarantee that the adequate proceedings are undertaken during trial, that reasonable doubt is extinguished, and that common sense is respected when limiting the punishment options that may be chosen by the victim (our common sense is also expected to have evolved by this point).

If the previous steps all work as intended, the simple emission of a wanted notice or arrest warrant should suffice for the population itself to nab and bring any person accused of a crime to court, for which service they ought to be rewarded by the state, much like the bounty hunters of the Old American West (yes, I'm serious).

The right of self-defence – against *any* kind of attack – must not only be fully respected but also encouraged, since handling a situation on one's own and/or with the help of nearby others, who presumably witnessed what happened and know for a fact who's right and who's wrong, is the quickest, cheapest and most efficient

way to resolve a conflict, as it wastes no time and does not require the allocation of extra resources. In such cases, as soon as the victim decides the punishment dispensed on-site was enough, no further action would need to be taken against the criminal.

Torture should be used in the most cruel cases (which by this point should be extremely rare), as a deterrent against those who may eventually intend to commit the most heinous kinds of crimes.

The death penalty should be given whenever it is clear that a criminal isn't fit to live in a civilized society. As a rule, there's no fixing that; if it's ever fixable, fixing it is not worth the risks, troubles and costs involved in attempting to (as with many things, making a new human being is much easier than trying to repair a broken one).

Long-term jailing should never be used, as it is highly expensive and serves no constructive purpose.

Upon successfully implementing this step, crime should be virtually extinguished. Global crime rates should drop to Japanese standards, and then further.

Step 6: To automate all of our production lines and establish a universal basic income.

Both these things must be done at the same time, because fully automating our production lines would cause a massive spike in unemployment rates while paying idle people would cause an equally huge spike in demand, which, without automation, the industry wouldn't be able to shoulder.

Automating our industries as much as we *already* can would largely boost our production while also freeing millions or billions of people from doing something they don't want to. These could all then pursue their own personal interests, which should lead to beneficial developments to all of us (at the very least people would be happier, and thus more likely to help and less likely to harass each other).

The universal basic income – which translates into a minimum wage being paid to every unemployed person – should be very easy to implement without an overgrown state wasting massive

amounts of everyone's time and resources. And that UBI should have a value that allows for anyone to live with minimum comfort, having a place to live in, enough to pay their bills, own basic furniture and appliances. It should enable people not to have to *worry* about their financial present and future – but no more than this. Not only should this be attainable thanks to the drastically lowered costs of maintaining the state's bureaucracy, but it should also be perfectly viable resource-wise thanks to the drastically reduced human population. (Note that a universal basic income cannot, *under any circumstances*, be adopted without population control policies, otherwise the worst among us would automatically start reproducing like cockroaches instead of bed bugs.)

Those employed – people who are still necessary for certain tasks, or who otherwise actively contribute to the advancement of our species or to the improvement of our general well-being – ought to be rewarded for their services, being paid more and/or having privileged access to scarcer or high-demand products and real state properties, being entitled to use premium park spots, or receiving other benefits of a similar nature. That might end up dividing the human race into two *castes*. But these have always existed – we just pretend they don't. With a more enlightened humanity though, those in the “upper caste” should be able to refrain themselves from rubbing their contributions on the “lower caste's” face, while those belonging to this one should also be reasonable enough to understand that the benefits the others receive are *deserved*. And since everyone would be free to move from one caste to the other whenever they so wished (so long as they were capable and willing to put in the effort), this particular division shouldn't represent a problem.

After implementing this step, our production should surpass the demands of our species, we should all be able to afford at least everything we *need*, and people would no longer be forced to spend all day long doing something against their will just to stay alive, just to continue to suffer.

Step 7: To unify the economy under a single currency.

Currency exchange rates make (in good part, albeit not single-handedly) it so that two people doing the exact same job are paid

wildly varying wages for their services simply due to applying their skills on different parts of the planet. It's unfair. And a global currency would also simplify any international transaction, facilitating the exchange and transit of goods across the globe.

This is a relatively easy measure to adopt, and one of the long-established steps to create a "union" of countries (I'm not sure if that's the appropriate technical terminology. The European Union is a concrete example of such "unification," having already adopted this particular step as well as a few others, such as allowing free transit across member-states' borders).

After establishing a single global currency, the same work would have the same value wherever it was done (quality would still be a distinguishing factor, affecting worth). Regardless of where someone was born, they'd be paid what society – *global* human society; not the local one – deemed fair for their efforts, and they'd have access to the same products as everyone else, being able to afford them on the same grounds as most other people (logistics-borne increases in cost would still apply.)

Step 8: To establish an official human language.

The need for clear communication goes without saying – if we cannot understand each other, we cannot work together or coexist in harmony.

After physical differences, different languages are the most obvious indicator used by us to segregate ourselves into distinct groups. And as I have previously claimed, whenever we see "others" as such we antagonize them because they are not "us," thus being a potential threat, disturbing our peace.

This one is also a particularly easy step to implement, and one that is well worth its costs. All that needs to be done is to teach all of our children our chosen universal language *first*, before any other (while the usage of more than one language still persists). After this transition has been done once, it never needs to be done again.

The greatest issue may be deciding on, or rather *developing* an appropriate, efficient language for global usage (maybe Esperanto could work).

Step 9: To form a global government and abolish democracy.

This should happen as a natural consequence of the previous steps. It is only logical for all of us to become united under a single flag and leadership once we all share similar genetic traits, the same moral and cultural values, speak the same language, use the same currency and have the same education and opportunities.

Even with a much better population than the one we currently have, the best among us would still be, by definition, better than most of us. And they would still be the ones who should lead our species.

Smarter people can see and understand things the rest of us can't. The average human, thus, would still be prone to disagreeing with the best of us then, after all the previous steps had been adopted, as they are now. And when disagreements arise, the ones in the right (who I'm logically assuming are to be those who are smarter) must always have the final word.

A democracy might work once we are better, but it's never going to be *ideal*. A communist anarchy can only work for a hive-mind species, which we'll probably never be. Socialism policies could be fairly adopted, but socialism is an economic and political ideology only, one that doesn't consider or suggests a particular governing system. Thus, I believe our species should be governed by an intellectual aristocracy, a monarchy or an absolutist AI.

The monarchy is a valid option, but carries some high risks. Being led by an AI is a gamble, potentially being our best or worst option. And this makes an intellectual aristocracy our safest bet.

Step 10: To disassemble all armies.

All armed forces on the planet should be disbanded, as by this point they would no longer be necessary.

Countries with extraordinary military strength have a *need* to use their power, because maintaining it is highly expensive. Armed forces must find something to destroy to *justify* their own existence because, if they don't, all that's spent on them is entirely

wasted. (Also, it's no fun to have a toy and not be able to play with it.)

Once all previous steps had been successfully implemented, we would no longer need to destroy anything, because the only thing we currently need to destroy is ourselves – those of us who are “unlike us.” Upon achieving genetic, cultural, moral, and some level of financial *homogeneity*, we would no longer be our own enemies and this, in turn, would leave us with none.

Disbanding our armed forces would shut down another one of the largest sinkholes of humanity's wealth, while also extinguishing the second and last of our “most dreadful tools of oppression.”

If two countries have any misunderstandings, they cannot solve it diplomatically and the “global government” can't help them find a common ground either, their own civilian populations should serve as their armies. This would be fairer, as people's will to fight is tied to the value of what they are fighting for (which includes whether they are in the right or not) and, most importantly, it would make it so that no one would *ever* want to go to war, since everyone would be at risk of dying, there would be no experts in warfare (so no personal *advantage*), and no one would be available who had etched into themselves a mindset that makes them *want* to murder others (as professional soldiers have).

Heavy-weapons production should be limited, and this limit should be the same for every country. Ideally, we would no longer need those, but even at this point we still wouldn't *fully* trust each other, and a chance that we might eventually face some extraterrestrial threat would also remain. Thus, heavy weapons development and the existence of [fairly small] arsenals would still be somewhat necessary.

The manufacturing of such weapons should remain in states' hands, as they are only meant to work for the sake of all, never of one or just a few.

All countries would probably decide to compulsorily enlist a small part of their populations to train for a certain period of time, so as to have people who know how to use advanced armaments in case the need ever arose. This military training should also be standardized throughout all of Earth's nations, not allowing for any country (or “region,” since we are talking about a unified

planet) to have a greater number of trained personnel than another, as a second means to maintain “the balance of power.”

Our nuclear weapons should all be handed to our global government and then dismantled, since nukes don’t have so much effect in space. Their only use is to destroy our own planet. (As a curiosity: blowing up a nuclear weapon in space sends a strong EMP blast down to Earth’s surface, potentially disabling most of the electric infrastructure of an *entire continent* depending on the blast’s height. And this means that, if someone starts destroying satellites up there, someone else will probably start blowing nukes in space to disable competing countries [in our current, *real* scenario]).

So long as we make sure that every country has about the same fighting chance against any other (roughly, since despite limiting weapon productions and military training populational numbers would still largely vary), disassembling our armies should end our large-scale multilateral slaughters once and for all.

Step 11: To make life on Earth sustainable.

We should find a way to convert all of our energy sources into renewable ones, to recycle as many materials as we can and, if at all possible, to efficiently synthesize heavier atoms from lighter ones (fusion energy seems to be only some twenty years ahead of us).

Having stabilized our society, we should proceed to stabilize our planet’s resources as well, guaranteeing we wouldn’t run out of them anytime soon. (We have already started worrying about this, but the issue can’t actually be *solved* without the previous steps.)

Step 12: To actively improve ourselves.

Upon creating social and economic stability, implementing justice, unifying our species and finally achieving stable peace, we would have all the time in the universe (or at least until our Sun died, Earth fell too close to it, a massive asteroid hit us [again] or our planet’s magnetic field got blown away) to focus on improving ourselves.

We should then spend as much time as necessary tampering with our own genetic code, all the while reinforcing the structures of our new society to make them as solid as possible as we aim to turn ourselves into the best beings we can, on our own, become.

The whole process, from the first step until the end of this one, could take thousands of years.

Step 13: To explore and expand.

Once we have adopted all the previous steps and, after millennia, the day has finally come when we can be *proud* of being human, we may allow ourselves to spread and share what we have learned and “created,” to explore our galaxy and meet species far more advanced than ours.

If we ever succeed in implementing this little “plan” of mine (and, of course, if it works as intended), somewhere between steps 12 and 13 is probably where our first official diplomatic encounter with extraterrestrial species will happen. And what comes after that is too far-fetched for me to guess – the “real future” begins there.

Humanity’s limits will match the Milky Way’s and, one day, perhaps the universe’s. Guided by our much elder and far wiser alien brothers, we will strive to keep up with them as together we seek to unravel all the mysteries of the cosmos and materialize the very best it has to offer.

While some of us seek to uncover the deepest secrets of existence, others will spend their time helping inferior animals, disabling nuclear weapons, destroying meteors and correcting misguided AI codes on planets much like 21st century Earth. And those who opt not to do any of that will be free to simply enjoy themselves.

If we ever make it this far, our lives will finally be worth living.

CHAPTER IV: Random Thoughts

Though I couldn't quite fit some ideas into any of the other chapters, I'm not willing to omit them. Compared to the major points I've made so far, the following could be seen as mere details in the bigger picture. Nonetheless, they are tied to everything else, they still matter, and they are interesting anyway.

Just prepare yourself for jarring changes of subject from one topic to the next and let's get to it.

Word

Words are used to encode and transmit information, make dogs roll, cheer a drunk man into doing something stupid, curse politicians and bitch about life. But that's not all that's interesting about them.

For starters, words are a very *inefficient* way to communicate. We know what we want to say long before we start talking, and yet it takes several seconds or even minutes to vocalize it. Then, the listener may take anything between a second and forever to actually understand what we tried to convey.

Due to the restrictions of our languages, to the limited means we have to share our thoughts (voice/text/drawings; oral/visual), there's also information we are simply *unable* to exchange with others. For us to explain something to another person, they need to know all the words we use in our explanation as well as their meaning. Words can be learned, so that's not much of a problem. But there are concepts we have no names for, and others that not everyone is familiar with. In particular, there are feelings only we, and no one else, know. We can't tell someone *exactly* how we feel; we can't precisely describe a specific pain; we can't accurately convey how much we love or hate something through words. And since how we feel is the only thing that matters to us, being unable to communicate it accurately is a problem.

We are not going to overcome the limitations of our means of communication anytime soon, so they are bound to remain an issue – one that gives rise to countless others – for the foreseeable future. The best we can currently do is probably to come up a new language deliberately created to be more efficient than any of our current ones, and then make it our whole species' official idiom. In fact, some

people have already tried to do that – as I have said before, *Esperanto* seems to be one such language. (Remember that guy I mentioned in Chapter II, who promised to teach me and my friends some weird things? Esperanto was one of them. It seemed like a complete waste of time back then, but now I get why he thought we should learn it.)

Ideally, we should develop telepathy. I don't know if this is a possible evolutionary step for human beings but, if we ever manage to acquire such a skill, it will be like switching from smoke signals to cell phones.

The most important thing about words, though, may be that, since we think using them, they *shape* the way we do so. They may limit what we can think about, and make certain thoughts and conclusions easier or harder to have or reach.

Have you ever seen a Japanese movie? None of them makes any sense (the dialogues, in particular). I mean it: they are completely insane. If that were my only source of information about the Japanese people, I would have concluded they are all retarded. But they are not. Even though they speak, and thus think, in a crazy way (from a Western's perspective), their numbers still add up the same way ours do, their cars have four wheels and move forwards, their computers work, etc. And it's somewhat curious that we reach the same logical conclusions even though our thought processes differ quite a lot.

Speaking of the Japanese, I have a theory about Asian *writing*: as its symbols and their usage are much more complicated than the Latin alphabet's, they end up having the side effect of making Asian people a little more intelligent than the rest of us, since writing is taught to children while their brains are still in frantic development and Asian kids probably need to work much harder to learn their scripts (which, by the way, are, in the majority of cases, phonetic and not ideographic) than we have to to learn ours.

Asia aside, I, myself, sometimes have to think in English because my native language is not as flexible and makes it harder to put certain things into words, to accurately convert certain ideas into sentences. Many words that exist in English simply do not have an equivalent in my language (700,000 words versus 300,000), and some expressions

require many words to be said in mine while they can be said with two or three in English. Sometimes, it's the other way around.

Some languages allow for the easy construction of a new word, making it so that when anyone hears it, even if that word has never been uttered before, its meaning is either instantly clear or at least easier to infer by context (which is how we learn 99.9% of our vocabularies). Others are not as flexible.

Language *structures* also vary. Some of them have articles, while others don't; in some of them adjectives precede nouns, while in others they follow; some assign different meanings to the same word depending on where it lies on a sentence or on what tone of voice is used when it's said aloud. And depending on all of those characteristics, certain languages may restrain our very thoughts more than others. Some, if not all of them, may even *prevent* certain ideas from occurring to us.

Some languages also use gender-specific articles, whereas others don't. A plural may be established by an "s" at the end of a word, tacitly by context, and/or it may require a previous usage, in the same sentence, of a specific pronoun. Depending on the language used, we must know different things *beforehand*, prior to constructing and starting to utter a sentence, to be able to convey what we want. The *order* that abstract notions follow when we are thinking, as we try to convert ideas into words, changes. And this is something that we learn, something that must be physically built. It's something that requires specific neurological changes, affecting the very way our brains work.

Since words invoke meanings, the very way we think is based upon the language we use. For instance, in a language in which adjectives precede nouns, recalling an adjective brings to one's mind the most common nouns associated with it. In one in which adjectives follow nouns, the opposite happens: recalling a noun brings to one's mind the most common adjectives associated with it. For a person who speaks a certain language, thinking about the word "zebra" immediately chains their thoughts to one set of words and meanings, while for a second person, who speaks another, it leads to a completely different one. And those "word-chains" are physical, neurological ones, because it is our language that determines how the neurons in certain parts of the human brain connect to each other.

The language we speak literally guides our thoughts, and each different one leads us through a unique path that can be more or less permissive and efficient than others, potentially allowing or prohibiting us from understanding certain things.

As a quick exercise, try to think without using words.

We do that all the time to move, breath, make menial decisions or to play a merry tune on the ukulele. But when thinking *abstractly*, it becomes harder. To formulate complex thoughts, it seems we need to first convert them into words.

I have a theory that we are unable to *store* thoughts unless we do that conversion. It could be a “my brain” thing, but I have the impression we cannot remember an idea we didn’t save in verbal form. Without converting them into words, our thoughts may happen too fast to be “etched” into our neurons, too quickly for our brains to have time to undergo whatever process it uses to store information for the long-term. Maybe that process isn’t activated at all unless we do that conversion.

Ask yourself this: what happened in the old days, when we did not yet have languages? How did you think before you learned your first one, when you were a tot?

Though we have all once been speechless toddlers, we cannot recall how we thought then, or even imagine it. And this “verbal memory hypothesis” of mine might explain why none of us can remember our earliest childhood.

Less about words themselves and more about interpersonal communication: *talking* to other people is mostly pointless.

As I said when I talked about the weirdness of freedom of speech, talking is something that affects others instead of ourselves. And when we pass some of our knowledge to another person, *we* don’t gain anything – only the listener does (*if* they understand and assimilate it). We have to organize our thoughts, come up with a way to convey them clearly and utter them aloud so that someone *else* gains something and grows somehow. To make matters worse, if we succeed at doing that, only one person, or a few at best, will have learned something. If you have something important to say and you

use speech as the means to convey it, your idea will most likely die out because you won't be transmitting it to a large enough audience.

Mostly, we chitchat. As a rule, people just throw random, useless words about irrelevant topics out there, all the time, at anyone who's listening. We hardly ever talk to transmit actual knowledge, to cause some sort of positive impact other than mild, fleeting amusement. We talk about other people, sports and cars. On the comparatively rare occasions when something relevant is brought up, such as politics or the economy, we just *complain* about it – discussing non-trivial topics requires some understanding, a little thinking, and thus some actual effort, so we avoid it as much as we can. The vast majority of what we say is nothing but hot air; just wasted breath.

If you have anything significant to convey to others, you must *write* it.

The written word reaches much farther than the spoken one. It's solid and long-lasting. Anyone who comes across it and can't understand what they are reading or forgets soon afterwards can re-read what is written as many times as they want until they get the message. If they think that information has some value, they can pass it down to others, *literally* (not misinterpreted by the reader's lack of intelligence or disfigured by his poor memory), without requiring the writer's presence or consent. Written ideas can long outlive their authors, and potentially reach the entire human race.

Writing serves a constructive purpose. Talking hardly ever does.

I'm sure any linguist could elaborate much further on everything I just said, that they would have far more to tell you about our words and means of communication. But that's all I got on my own.

I think it was the movie *Arrival* that first made me stop to think about the deeper aspects of our languages so, if you haven't watched it, I suggest you do (it's a great movie anyway).

This topic was just meant to open your eyes to the fact that the language we use has a much more significant impact on our lives and minds than we usually give them credit for.

Hype

Striving to take all the money in the world for themselves, for-profit companies make use of two “techniques” that work hand-in-hand: *marketing* and *publicity*.

Since people who work in any area try to define what they do in the most complicated terms possible with the deliberate intention of barring any “outsider” from understanding what they do, so that they seem smarter than everyone else and, most importantly, necessary when they are [often] not, I’ll forego mentioning the technical definition of each (“marketing” and “publicity”) and instead define them in my own terms.

Marketing is responsible for creating a product with a target audience in mind, or for finding the appropriate audience for a product that already exists. It aims to understand the market, discover unfulfilled needs, tailor products to certain kinds of people, and find a way to make those potential customers aware of the product’s existence. Publicity, on the other hand, is responsible for actually transmitting that information, effectively drawing attention to the product. It aims to show people why and how that product can make their lives better, in an attempt to convince them to buy it.

So far, so good – both things seem to serve the general good, as they should. But when human greed enters the scene, those two reasonable devices become twisted: marketing becomes responsible for *creating* a need, so that a useless product can fly off the shelves; for rebranding, so that a horrible mistake seems like a brilliant invention; for creating side effects, which a second product can profit from; and for tie-in sales that force people to pay for something they don’t want. Publicity, in turn, appeals to people’s emotions instead of their reasoning, to fool them into believing that a pseudo-need is not only real but its fulfillment also worth a hefty sum of money. It aims to make a company – and by extension anything it says or does – look fancy and admirable, regardless of how many children were enslaved, how many forests were chopped down, how many animals were tortured and butchered, or how many people have been made sick, were maimed or died to develop and craft their products. It makes people believe “everyone’s doing it!” when no one is.

When twisted marketing and twisted publicity get together, we get *hype*. Companies assault us with every mind game they have available, everywhere, all the time, to syphon money out of our wallets. It doesn’t matter if we need or want anything, if their products work or not, if their services will help or hinder us. All that matters is finding the *lie* that will make us poorer and them richer,

and then spending billions on making as many people as possible believe in it.

We see soda companies' toxic logos stamped on professional athletes' jerseys, celebrities advertising overpriced cars with factory flaws and bank ads claiming that *not* providing any kind of customer support is good for their clients. Hype works so well that many people, nowadays, believe that buying a smartphone that costs thousands of bucks, then finding, downloading and installing an app in it (which requires an internet connection), filling out a form and navigating through several different screens before they can finally *order diner* (paying considerably more for it thanks to the unnecessary third-party app) is the best way to do so, simply because some big companies assured them that making a simple phone call is "way harder!" and also "not nearly as cool!"

As another example, you may or may not have heard about a woman called Elizabeth Holmes (the psychopath founder of the *Theranos* company). She had this "amazing" idea of creating a small machine that would do the job of entire buildings of laboratories automatically and in just a few minutes, conducting all possible tests from a single drop of thumb blood. That woman lied so hard that she managed to fool people into giving her nearly one billion dollars to invest into her obviously impossible, juvenile "dream" (at maximum, her company reached a private valuation of US\$9 billion). Long story short, she ended up in jail. But it's funny that among the people she managed to swindle with a ridiculous fantasy were several top-ranking American politicians and government officials, including Henry Kissinger, George Shultz and James Mattis. When watching the movie about her (*The Inventor: Out for Blood in Silicon Valley*), without having ever heard about the woman or her company, it took me less than one minute to think to myself, "Dude... that's clearly impossible to be done," and yet a bunch of people who directly interfere (or once did) with the future of our whole species couldn't see it and supported her for *years*.

Combined with her lies, Lizzy Holmes' aggressive and demagogic hype managed to fool countless Americans, without her ever having anything concrete to back it up.

There's one more notorious case I'm particularly fond of: *sunscreens*.

When doctors turned skin cancer into a “fashionable trend,” Big Pharma saw an amazing opportunity to profit from it. Pharmaceutical companies bet heavily on people’s newly-discovered fear, spending a decade or so trying to convince everyone that we *need* to wear sunscreen whenever we find ourselves in direct sunlight. Those companies spent some ten years doing everything they could, mustering all the marketing and publicity shenanigans they honed over decades and investing billions of dollars to convince us that we need to smear our whole bodies with some disgusting cream every time we leave our homes.

This sunscreen case is utterly ridiculous for two reasons: first, because Big Pharma *really* thought people would buy and use their products even after living an entire life (or worse: thousands of generations) under the sun [mostly] without problems; and second, because it failed.

The pharmaceutical industry bet a fortune on human stupidity, which I will grant them is one of the safest bets there is. But they tried to exploit it *so* hard that they actually managed to underestimate our species’ average intelligence. Eventually they gave up, signing off billions of dollars as a bad investment and moving on to some other scheme.

I spent an entire decade laughing at their commercials. In fact, I still laugh every time I think about that. Big Pharma, as rich and powerful as it is, was responsible for the one time I know of when hyping *didn’t* work.

Just remember: no company cares about you. They seek your money, not your well-being. Beware of any that claims the opposite – the more enthusiastic their claim, the more wary you should be.

The Ball

I’ve bashed athletes more than once throughout this text, and that implies a critique on *sports* themselves that I feel like I should clarify. (And since I’m clarifying things: I picked the title above because most of our physical activities revolve around this magnificent, bouncing and rolling spherical object that seems to utterly amuse, amaze and awe the average human mind.)

As you have probably inferred due to the above, I'm terrible at sports. I can ride a skate or a pair of them, but I can't stop either. I can drop and ride a wave forward until it dies out, but I'm unsure of how to turn the board to a side and *actually* ride it. I can play soccer, but only on the defence and, once I steal the ball from someone, I have no idea what to do with it. I can kick that thing considerably harder than most people, but it never goes quite where I want it to. Apparently, I *can* climb a wall, but I've only done that once, in a climbing gym, when I was 10. I did spend 20 years lifting weights, but this doesn't require any skill and it also turned out to be a complete waste of time. In short, my brain is not made for that stuff. And I'm not a fan of "team activities" either.

Since I suck at them, I *am* biased about sports. But I can appreciate their entertainment value nonetheless – I watch as much of the Olympic Games, the winter ones and the World Cup as I possibly can, as well as tennis Grand Slams, a bit of sports climbing, some boxing, eventually a little golf.

Basic physical activities (such as running or lifting weights) are tiresome, painful and boring, so sports are a great way to turn that around, allowing people to exercise and have fun at the same time. So long as we don't overdo it (which can lead to lesions, the need for surgeries, heart attacks, chronic pains, etc.), practicing them is a welcome way to keep people fit, even if I, personally, don't partake.

But those are the only two upsides of sports: they are a fun way to exercise, and they can be entertaining to watch. That's all.

We often hear that sports teach children discipline and how to be a team player, but that's nonsense. The "discipline" they teach is that of being subservient to *others*, i.e., to a coach. And no one needs to be *taught* actual discipline (which I would define as "being able to force oneself to endure the sacrifices necessary to achieve a particular goal"), because the need of it is obvious to anyone and, if a person doesn't have it, it's *their* loss – it doesn't matter to the rest of us.

The "being a team player" aspect of sports is, on the other hand, downright noxious. What it ultimately teaches is that one should always defend those who are on *their side*, no matter what, and always try to *destroy everyone else* (any other team). We already naturally think this way, but deliberately encouraging such a mentality, finding new ways to segregate ourselves and creating

artificial divisions between us for no valid reason is suicidal. This doesn't make us any better.

Sports also don't serve any long-term goal. Whatever we do in our lives is *not* inherited by our children – other than bathing in radiation, nothing we do alters our genome. Genetically speaking, all of our lives' efforts are wasted. Sure, those who *survive* strenuous physical activities have, implicitly, a better set of genes to endure and execute them than others, which means that, if we force everyone to exert themselves until most people literally die of exhaustion, our surviving [physical] genetic pool will improve (which is what must have happened to slaves). But if only *some* of us become professional athletes and, at the same time, we keep all reproducing randomly, there's no improvement whatsoever – with time, those genes become rarer (as the population increases, the percentage of it comprised by professional athletes diminishes), and they get scattered and diluted, having an increasing chance of not being inherited, of not surviving, of being wasted. By the end, those genes (and/or alleles) are just naturally gone, because they are simply not necessary.

Our species doesn't need physical strength or aptitude. Given what we can now do with our minds and machines, our bodies are semi-useless. Their purpose is just to keep us alive; they are just mobile supports for our brains.

As another argument, world records are now rarely broken. In the Paris 2024 Olympics, almost none were. And this means we are already *physically stagnated*. Continuing to do these same activities we've been doing for centuries won't take us anywhere, because it never did and we can barely improve any further in this area (since the most physically apt among us seem to have reached their limit).

As a means of bettering ourselves, practicing physical activities is pointless. If you disagree, think about where all the sports matches ever played on Earth have taken us. Where is that?

Nowhere.

Nothing has been created or improved by athletes, by their competitions, victories and defeats. Other than for the brief entertainment all games ever played have provided, we have nothing to show for them. How relevant is it, now, a soccer match played in 1952? What's useful about knowing how it played out? How

important is its final score? Does history record ages, eras, changes in mentality, innovations and war, or athletic achievements?

If that was all, it wouldn't be so bad. But physical competitions actually have a *negative* effect on human society. As mentioned earlier, they teach and encourage us to side with one group and *actively antagonize* all others. Many people have even been killed due to that, because some of us are mentally-challenged to the point of considering "rooting for a different team" reason enough to justify murder. And the insults and attempts at humiliation one team's fans traditionally and constantly throw at others' breeds nothing but anger and conflict.

We encourage our children, at their youngest ages, to choose a team, pick a side, and provoke anyone who picked another. For what? What's the upside in that? We ask them what they want to be when they grow up, and 99% of kids answer, "A football player," "A basketball player," "A hockey player." What for? What use do we have for any of that?

As to sports competitions themselves, they lead to one party (the winning athlete/team) involved in any given tournament coming out satisfied, while all others leave disappointed, frustrated, angry. And what does the winning party *prove* by its success? In individual competitions, simply that they were luckier (more talented) than their opponents. In collective ones, the same, but with more variables. And our greatest competitive events - the Olympics and the World Cup - where victory is supposed to prove one *people* superior to another, prove nothing of the sort, because we have lots of athletes changing nationalities just to be able to compete, for whatever country they may do so. Half the German soccer team is comprised by *black* people, for God's sake.

All the worship and wealth invested into sports and those who practice them professionally not only lead nowhere, but it proves nothing as well. It's all just a show.

Sports have become a huge part of humanity's culture. They're so widely disseminated and their practice so often and strongly encouraged, being in fact *forced* upon all of us, that they have become almost an intrinsic part of "being human." But, once again, this artificial competitiveness and constant fighting for literally nothing is *toxic*. Despite the practice of physical activities having a

couple of upsides, the global result of our blind devotion to those who simply move and react faster than most is profoundly negative, because the forged importance we attribute to sports leads *directly* to a worse human existence.

Why do we do it, then? Because just as I am terrible at sports, the majority of human beings is terrible at using their brains. As Bertrand Russell once put it, "Most people would rather die than think; in fact, they do so." We always like, encourage and do that which is *easier* for us, and the majority of people finds it easier to play with a ball than with their minds. And it's the majority of people who dictate what our culture actually is and thus what we, as a species, are.

Despite the general consensus, sports are not the most relevant thing in life. Since we keep treating them as if they were, paying millions or billions of dollars to athletes, employing them in commercials of all kinds of different products and services, showing their feats multiple times a day on the TV and creating the biggest events on Earth around them, we've been encouraging our own species to move backward instead of forward. We keep fooling ourselves into believing that what should be avoided is to be pursued. We keep feeding the animality in us instead of the little, starving humanity we have.

Our cult of sports is idiotic. Pointless competitions take the spotlight while our species greatest tragedies and accomplishments happen in the shadows around it. When young, we aim to become something useless instead of the opposite. We praise talent instead of merit, seeking fame and easy money instead of the satisfaction of actually improving ourselves as individuals and as a species. We focus on our bodies instead of our minds, and on defeating others instead of helping them. Hence why, despite appreciating it's [mild] entertainment value, I'm not a big fan of sports, and much less of those who dedicate their entire lives to them.

People idolize some illiterate, ill-mannered, bullying arrogant imbecile because he can *run* faster than the rest of us. I mean... seriously, come on: what the fuck?

Sports are also indirectly tied to another, bigger problem.

As I said, for many people the brain is not their most valuable asset. We are all forced to go to school, and there we find out that some of

us can't understand anything - many kids do poorly in every single class, being unable to assimilate abstract concepts. Those children start feeling very bad about themselves from an early age, because they realize there's something wrong with them. The only thing school actually teaches those kids is that they are stupid, which is sad. That makes them feel inferior, and it makes them angry. Since they have no option but to somehow get through school while being incapable of doing it via the intended means, those children are forced to *cheat*. By forcing children onto that path, what we end up creating is angry people who know they are intellectually handicapped, who learned that cheating is a valid way to do things, and who have built their standard behavior around tricking others. In short, what we are doing is *breeding criminals*.

Since they suck at intellectual activities, those kids focus on physical ones, where they are able to find some success. Consequently, they tend to become much better at physical endeavors than those who focus on constructive ones. Knowing they stand no chance of ever having a productive intellectual career, those physically-focused kids with a learning disability tend to pick as their goal to become professional athletes, and this is what they pursue. When they fail at "going pro" - which is by far the most likely scenario, since only the luckiest of all are chosen to make a fortune out of kidding around - they must fall back to a plan B. Depending on a kid's growing environment, financial status, and on the size of their balls, that secondary plan will be to become a criminal (the second easiest way to make money for a cheater who can't think properly). If they are not quite fit for that career path, they'll instead attempt to join the military (in the US) or the police (elsewhere). Failing to join one of those, they'll try the other. And if none of that works, they'll look for a job in construction or at McDonald's.

Those people's career choices are limited. They have one shot at doing something useless but highly profitable and, failing that, they must resort to destructive or, at best, menial labor.

Here's my point: *our species has no use for those people*. (Working in construction might be an exception, but any engineer [who's already on site anyway] can easily lay down some bricks, operate a crane or connect some pipes as well, if they have to.)

The most important *apparent* use the "intellectually disfavored" have is tied to the military or the police. By joining such forces, they'll theoretically be working towards keeping us all safe. But what do our police and military forces keep us safe from? From criminals and

other countries' armed forces – in other words: from people just like them.

The existence of people who cannot think is *redundant*, because their only concrete purpose is *to destroy themselves*. If we didn't have any of them around, we wouldn't need them for anything.

There are some exceptions, of course, as always. George Foreman comes to mind, as he was a successful boxer, retired, and then moved on to making me sandwiches with his delightful grill. Some wrestlers (of the beloved-by-Mexicans kind of wrestling) become actors, and they keep entertaining us while also making a fortune. But what I said before is the general rule. After all, what use is there for people who cannot understand raw information and assimilate what our species has so far discovered, who cannot think on their own, reach logical conclusions and build upon them, or to at least keep repeating what others already do (so that what currently "works" keeps "working")?

"The redundants" are part of the people we must rid ourselves of – they form a large part of the "undesirables." The genes they carry once helped us survive, but that was a very long time ago. Now they hold our species back instead of helping move it forward, breeding violence, crime and war. Alongside psychopaths, "the redundants" are the source of all of our major problems, which they are far better at creating than fixing, ultimately leaving the latter to those among us who should be otherwise engaged in more constructive endeavors.

And being heavily into sports is a trait that virtually all redundant people share.

Just as an isolated curiosity: bodybuilding, or weight-lifting, is the healthiest physical activity there is, so long as steroids aren't used. People who practice it live, on average, 83 years. Swimming comes in second place, at 79 years. Tennis in third, at 77. And American football is the worst of all, beating even boxing by a large margin, leading to death at the average age of 56.

Conspiracy Theories

Do you know the difference between a conspiracy and a conspiracy theory? Not rarely, it's simply that the second hasn't been *proven* [yet].

As two concrete examples of that, we have the US invading Iraq while being fully aware that this one was *not* producing nuclear weapons (the Iraqi regime also had no links whatsoever to Al-Qaeda, which was the second argument used as *casus belli*), and the NSA spying on all private communications of every person on Earth. Both cases were just crazy conspiracy theories made by doomsday heralds, until an investigation or a whistleblower proved them right.

Another example is the theory that the Covid 19 virus originated from a leak in the Wuhan Institute of Virology rather than from zoonotic transmission in a natural setting (which is the official version of the "facts"). I recently looked into it, and the laboratory leak theory is actually *far* more plausible. According to specialists questioned by the United States' Committee of Oversight and Accountability, there's strong evidence leading to this conclusion¹⁵. And why isn't this the understanding disseminated by politicians and the media? Because the Chinese and members of the American government itself tried to cover it up – the first, because they accidentally released a biological weapon they created (and developing such weapons is illegal under international treaties that, like all others, nobody respects), killing millions of people worldwide; the second, because they were *financing* the development of such weapons in Wuhan's lab (according to one of the specialists heard by the aforementioned committee).

To be fair, "biological weapons" was *my* chosen terminology. What they have been doing in Wuhan is, technically, "gain-of-function research." That means they are studying and implementing ways to increase the attributes of viruses, upgrading these ones' means of contagion, reducing their incubation period, increasing their lethality rates, etc. And since viruses can very easily be weaponized – so easily that they can even be accidentally unleashed – that's just a fancy and deliberately misleading way to say "development of biological weapons."

¹⁵ **Source:** <https://oversight.house.gov/release/hearing-wrap-up-suppression-of-the-lab-leak-hypothesis-was-not-based-in-science> (Accessed on February, 2024)

Those examples were just an introduction, so that I can finally say that we have two kinds of people around: conspiracy theorists, and those who mock them. Most members of the first group are deranged lunatics, while a few are reasonable people who are actually onto something. And the members of the second group are mostly right, but every now and then they end up doing us all a great disservice.

If you are someone who *indiscriminately* discredits anyone who questions the establishment, think about what you have been doing. If you are being paid to do so, I get it: you are a selfish person, which is only natural for a human being. And you are a shitty one. Otherwise, you automatically believe in whatever you are told by the government, large companies, random experts and [any] media vehicles, which means you are gullible instead.

If you fit that second description, think about this: what is the main target of conspiracy theories? Governments. What is a government *unable* to do? Virtually nothing. Who polices it? Itself; ergo, no one. What are the odds of a human being doing something wrong when they can easily get away with it? Practically guaranteed. And the odds of them spontaneously confessing what they did? Non-existent. Who has solid *proof* of a government's misdeeds? Only people who work for, and thus comprise the government itself. What happens to those who try to collect that proof and make it public? They are persecuted, arrested, tortured, murdered and/or forced to flee into exile. And what happens to the evidence, *if* a whistleblower ever manages to acquire and share it? The government officially belittles it and attempts to discredit the person that made the evidence public, as hard as it can and for as long as it takes to fool enough people or for everyone to simply forget about it (which doesn't take long). And what happens to the people who doubt the government's lies? They are mocked and discredited as well, by the people who fell for those lies – by people like you (again: in case you are gullible).

It's so, so easy for governments or specific individuals highly positioned within them to commit immoral and illegal acts that, being familiar with the human being, it's much more reasonable to assume conspiracies do happen than to assume they don't. Actually, that hedging was unnecessary – it's *guaranteed* that they happen, since there are entire governmental agencies that in fact exist exclusively to conspire (CIA, MI5, Mossad, SVR, etc.).

Since in governmental conspiracies all proof tends to be in possession of the conspirator(s) and kept safely away from the

general public by a throng of armed men, any logical indication, the mere hint or plausibility of something wrong having being done *is* enough to doubt the official narrative, because no one will ever initially have more than that. To have more we need a whistleblower or for a mistake to be made by the conspirators themselves. And the first one is more likely to surface, and the second more likely to occur, after someone first suggests an irregularity happened or is currently taking place.

In most cases, bringing any government member to justice *begins* with postulating a theory, because to question their doings is the first step to uncovering their misdeeds and, until we find out what really happened, all we can do is guess (theorize). Someone must notice the small bits of information that do not add up, and wonder about the bits that do but, suspiciously, are officially denied.

When someone goes around mocking people for at least trying to think and help, for publicly questioning that which most of us fear to question, they act as an irresponsible *censor*. They attempt to silence things that must be said and heard, because people and institutions that have an even stronger than natural tendency to commit crimes and lie, while their actions also affect millions or billions of lives at once, must be held on a *very* tight leash. Whether a conspiracy theory is right or wrong is almost irrelevant when compared to the possibility of it being cogitated, uttered, shared and investigated.

When someone censors that questioning, they also act as a counter-intelligence agent. Unknowingly, every now and then, they'll be denying the truth and effectively disseminating a fantasy. In fact, [counter-]intelligence agencies *do* count on common people to do that. Such institutions don't target the "theorists" themselves, because doing so would legitimize these ones' claims. Instead they use "anti-theorists" as puppets, so that these will do the discrediting and misleading work for them and for free.

Don't forget that governments aren't the only institutions that routinely conspire. Anyone with enough money can do the same, with those too-big-to-fail companies people trust so blindly much ranking *second* on the "who lies to you the most" list.

And also remember that at least some of those "mad" conspiracy theorists are, in fact, looking out for *us* too, however wrong they may turn out to be. If you have reason or evidence to discredit one of

their suspicions, by all means go ahead and do it. But if you don't, it's better to just stay quiet.

Having said what I just did, I'd be remiss if I didn't mention fake news disseminators like Alex Jones (who fooled 25% of the American population into believing one of their classic school massacres didn't really happen, just to profit from it) and "troll farms" such as Russia's (which create fake and misleading theories and news, as well as millions of fake accounts and entire websites dedicated exclusively to disseminating them).

As a rule, you should never believe *anything* you read or hear on the internet other than what comes directly from serious media vehicles, from long-standing companies that employ real journalists and have a notorious history of sticking [close enough] to the actual facts. And even then you should still take everything with a grain of salt, because private and biased opinions have a way of sneaking into anything any of us says or writes.

If you are gullible enough to fall for fake news, you should refrain from *ever* using YouTube, TikTok, Whatsapp and the such, because any idiot can say anything they want in those platforms and the companies operating them are filled with people who don't have the faintest idea of what is real and what is not – they are mostly comprised by censors of the most incompetent category: brainwashed Gen Zs. If you cannot easily separate ill-conceived fantasies from minimally plausible facts and you have a hard time identifying reasonable arguments, you should keep yourself safely away from the biggest sources of lies.

If you are *not* that naive, though, you can afford to give some crazy theories that don't directly violate anything you are sure of a little credit, because they might eventually be right.

Just to seize the opportunity, let me share a small conspiracy "theory" of my own.

I suspect these pro-socialism, pro-black, pro-women and pro-gay movements we have been trying to deal with in the West were, and continue to be, strongly and covertly prodded by Russia. Whether they started it and the financial reasons I mentioned earlier in this

text followed them, or if it was the other way around, I cannot say for sure. But my money is on the second alternative.

“Active measures” are so typical of Russia that even without any hard evidence it’s very likely they have a finger in it when any negative political movement rises in the West, because they are the ones who profit from weakening an enemy state (in the present case, by instigating populism in it). Russian agents are probably not smart, influential or diligent enough to start such movements (their go-to move is to create and finance communist parties and elect puppets), but they are surely smart and influential enough to *take advantage* of them once they “naturally” arise.

In its own territory, Russia is against “minority rights” (a term that pretty much sums up all major political problems Western countries currently have), which makes it only logical that they favor it in their enemies’ – if they believe one course of action is beneficial, they’ll want those they seek to destroy to pursue the opposite one.

Given how much damage minority rights movements have caused, it’s difficult to believe this whole “social justice” agenda is accidental, that those movements were spontaneously initiated by the people directly interested (non-financially) in them, or even that they grew so out of proportions based on private companies’ and some individuals’ financial interests alone. People don’t rally together to the point of causing this much damage without deliberate, directed and professional incentive (from intelligence services, lobbying groups, NGOs and/or political parties). It’s highly likely that there is someone in the shadows who sees the bigger picture and moves the pieces around, encouraging and using the current Western state of affairs to achieve their private, nefarious ends. And Russia is, once again, the party most interested in seeing this “political correctness” nonsense spread, knowing full well it will severely cripple us if we fail to deal with it.

Et... voilà! It has been working beautifully! In this particular war, the Russians have long been humiliating us. They kept seeding our backyards with water hemlocks for decades as we sat back and happily watched them grow. Now we are reaping out and naively eating them, stupidly mistaking those lethally poisonous plants for yummy parsnips.

That was all just a theory. But if true, it would also explain why Russia is always so bold: because they are *used* to kicking the West’s

ass from behind the curtains. Or perhaps “from beneath the sheets,” since after they are done with the kicking they are bound to proceed straight to... doing something worse.

(Long after writing that, I watched the documentary *Agents of Chaos*, by HBO. And lo and behold: my conspiracy theory was right.)

Death

It's impossible not to wonder about the end of our selves. What awaits us after death? Is there a heaven? Is there a hell? Is there anything at all?

I cannot say for sure because, as far as I know, I have never died before. But the odds do lean strongly towards certain possibilities.

Is there a heaven?

Not in the conventional sense, no. That would be absurd. Whatever exists after death, it is certainly nothing we, from within a human brain and mind, can fathom. There's most definitely *not* a harem filled with a thousand virgins just sitting there, waiting for you (and for them, that would be hell), nor a shiny palace in the clouds where a bearded old man sits on his throne, blowing the winds and calling the shots.

Is there a hell?

Yes - but we are already in it. After death, no, because this would be even *more* absurd. If I know it, then God (assuming there is one) also knows that everything that happens is inevitable, and He would not condemn anyone to “eternal damnation” because this would be completely irrational and unfair. Whatever anyone ever did is, deterministically, *His* fault and, if there's no God, I cannot see why and how a bunch of rocks floating around in space would create a spot somewhere, fill it with fire, diseases and whatnot, then miraculously bring the dead back to some state of life just to throw them in there forever.

Is there something else?

Maybe. Many people who have died and been brought back relate amazing visions and feelings. Most likely, those are just hallucinations. Or, maybe, time slows down as neurons deactivate in a dying person's brain, and those visions can seem to have lasted a long time when they actually manifested for less than a fraction of a second. Maybe parts of the brains of those who were resurrected were still active while they were briefly considered clinically dead. Or, maybe, what they see is real. In any case, it's a good thing that I have never heard one of those people relating *bad* post-mortem experiences.

Is there anything at all?

Sadly, the previous answers become nearly irrelevant now, because the odds are there isn't. Why would there be anything? *We are our brains*. All the evidence we have suggests we are simple physical beings. Once we die, we turn to ash or rotten flesh and what once formed our minds is scattered in the wind or buried in the dirt. There's no unity anymore, no billions of specialized cells working together to sustain thoughts and emulate feelings. There's nothing left to store memories in; there's nothing left of *us*.

Have you ever passed out? Been induced under general anesthesia, gone into an alcoholic coma, or got hit really hard in the head?

I have experienced all of those things. I've gone into half a dozen or so alcoholic comas, I've been given general anesthesia for a surgery, I've passed out due to low blood pressure once, and I've flown headfirst into the windshield during a car accident. And in every one of those cases, I had exactly the same experience: *nothing*. My eyes closed, I opened them a few seconds later, and minutes or hours had passed. There was no dream, no thoughts, no sense of time passing, no memories created, nothing. As far as I'm concerned, I wasn't there at all.

If passing out is enough to send us into absolute oblivion, what must death be like?

The odds are very high that, once we die... nothing.

And out of the things we humans can imagine, nothing is probably the best we could hope for – no feelings, no pain, no desires, no fears, no hurry, no anxiety, no ambitions, no body, no awareness, no urges, no shame, no grief, no regrets.

Nothing is perfect.

Be there something or not, being dead seems guaranteed to be a *lot* better than being alive.

Dying is to be feared. Death isn't.

I Shouldn't, but... I Do!

"Do you take this man/woman to be your husband/wife?" That is the question.

It seems to me that the marriage rite was invented to let the population of a tribe or village know that a man and a woman have been taken by each other, to forewarn them all that, if anyone else slept with one of the newly weds, jealous havoc would rightfully ensue. Some say the rite was meant to form a bond of power and/or wealth between two families instead, but this end must have come to justify marriage much later and only in certain cases, since such a goal was only a major concern for kings, nobles and the otherwise wealthy.

Nowadays, our "villages" have millions of peasants and no more than a few dozen of them will attend any single wedding ceremony. And marrying for "power fusion" no longer makes much sense either, because power is not hereditary anymore (although money still is). Thus, marrying someone has become almost entirely *pointless*.

Regardless, many people still get married. Why?

Tradition.

Human beings don't know how to live their lives; we don't know what to do with our time on Earth. Being idle is boring, so we need something to keep us busy even if it's an itch to scratch. Since most of us cannot think properly, being unable to figure out what to do on our own, we *imitate* others. After billions of people have made the same mistake, most of the rest of us assume that it simply can't be one. And we also keep marrying each other because most couples go around claiming that being married is blissful – even while deeply ruing it inside – so as not to "hear it" from their spouses once they get back home. We fall for it, believing they are being sincere, and proceed to repeat their mistake.

Those are the only two explanations I can think of as to why anyone would sign a contract exchanging part of their fundamental rights for a lot of legal obligations, and then spend a small fortune to celebrate such a regrettable decision.

Since we are able to fall in love, we like to believe we are a monogamous species; we like to believe such a feeling lasts forever. But we aren't and it doesn't, because that's simply not how the human brain works. *Everything* grows stale - it's just a matter of time. You have probably loved someone in the past, didn't get to be with that person and, by now, you have long forgotten or at least stopped caring about them, haven't you? I'd say this proves love, indeed, doesn't last - you have personally experienced it withering away and dying.

By all means, do feel free to love anyone. Just don't *marry* them. You don't have to, and it won't change how you feel. If it does, it will be for the worse.

People mostly marry simply for tradition, to imitate due to not thinking, because common "wisdom" dictates too many wrongs make a right. Sooner or later, though, all married couples are bound to realize they made a mistake.

I have a friend who dated the same girl for over a decade. They met in high school, hooked up, were each other's first boy/girlfriend and, after ten long years together, they finally managed to address the elephant in the room: that they both wanted to sleep with other people. They broke up less than a month later, each ran out to beat the other in getting laid first and, following their separate ways, they both lived happily ever after - which they only *could* because they didn't get married.

That story tells us three things:

- 1 - That sexual desire for any *one* person fades (and rather quickly) over time;
- 2 - That people have a hard time telling their "soul mates" that they are sick of them, and thus keep a relationship going for many years after it has become stale or even truly rotten;
- 3 - And that it's good to be free.

Legally binding oneself to someone else for *emotional* “reasons” is a logical error. And it violates our natural programming, because we are made to grow tired of any single person, to lose interest in them due to repetition/over-familiarity. I seriously doubt any one of us is interesting enough to overcome that.

Another reason why marrying someone is a mistake is because, after a person is [almost] irrevocably tied to their wife/husband, they feel entitled to “let go.”

Married people *can* and *do* take each other for granted because they signed a contract that says precisely that. Thus, both spouses tend to stop working out, dressing well, having manners, trying to please or impress the other. Once a person’s “better half” cannot escape them, a burden is lifted from their shoulders and they can finally go back to handling most aspects of their life and body as they *want* to (meaning “lazily”). This causes the person’s wife/husband to loathe them because, if a spouse changes in *any* way, they become something other than whom the person who married them agreed to “share a life with.” And even if a married person somehow manages to put in all the effort necessary and constantly police themselves to maintain their pre-wedding qualities, time inevitably changes us all, in nearly all aspects and mostly for the worse.

But let’s say that, despite your *own* best judgment, you got married anyway. Congratulations! (I swear to God I have no idea why people congratulate those who get engaged, married or pregnant.) Now, six months later, you are legally bound to a person that doesn’t look half as good as they did when you signed the deal and who doesn’t like you nearly as much as they did then either.

Late is said to be better than never, so you finally decide to give your situation some serious consideration and... you want a divorce!

But wait! It’s not that simple. Unbinding the two of you has severe legal implications, especially if you didn’t sign a pre-nup (in which case it might indeed be better to wait until death does you both apart). You *can* file for a divorce, just like 50% of couples (in the United States) do. But you hesitate, like the other 50%. Why? Because lawyers are too expensive. And it’s bad for the kids. Maybe you don’t want to legally fight your spouse, because you don’t hate them – you just don’t like them anymore. Or maybe you don’t want others to know you made a mistake, that your marriage is a failure

and that you were stupid enough to officialize it. Maybe you just don't want to admit it to yourself. Or maybe you need your spouse's money to do something you cannot afford on your own. You also probably won't be able to find a better replacement for your wife/husband, and you certainly don't want to go through all of that wooing crap ever again, especially now that you are old, fat, sick of everything and constantly tired. Not to mention that, sadly, "divorced" and "sexy" aren't quite the same thing.

Holy shit, what a trap!

Should you file for a divorce anyway, biting your own leg out of that lethal snare, or should you accept your fate and settle for a (dis)comfortable, mediocre life in which you'll never again get to do what you actually want?

I'll refrain from actually answering that because I don't want to add "home-wrecker" to my biography. Make up your own mind, since following others is exactly what put you in your current predicament.

Now, if you are *not* married, instead of weighing all of the above you can simply let out a long and relaxing sigh of honest relief, and stare at your God-given freedom with new, teared-up and elated eyes as you realize what a pitfall you managed to avoid.

If anyone ever tries to pressure you into a contractual, monogamous bondage, *smile*. Smile as you remind yourself that you don't need to be married to be with the person you love, to have children, or to do literally anything else.

Freedom! Hundreds of millions have fought, suffered and died for it. Don't give yours away for free.

As an aside: do you know why women love being gifted jewelry, and why they often *insist* on an expensive wedding ring?

I imagine it's because, if/when they get rid of their husbands (or vice versa), they can exchange those shiny treasures for cash. Insisting on a costly ring and accumulating gifted jewelry is a woman's way to guarantee they'll get away with at least *some* of their husband's money.

But I believe that's mostly in the past, now that women and men are granted similar education, working conditions and wages. And given how things worked in foregone times, their reason for insisting on

being presented with jewelry was solid. I don't blame them. Still, this is another fun "fact" (according to me) that I've never seen anyone daring to say out loud. So I had to mention it.

Let's Make Ourselves Great (for Once)

Until we manage to homogenize, unify and pacify our species, and maybe figure out how to artificially and responsibly alter our own DNA, there isn't much hope. Our screens will get thinner, our smartphones will gain more disk space and better cameras (as slowly for us and as profitably for their manufacturers as possible), but our world will essentially be just as ugly when we die as it was when we were born.

But there are some things you *can* do to help improve human life, and here's one of them: do you have children?

If not, well done! You shouldn't make any unless you *really* know what you're doing.

I have no children of my own, and this is by choice (mostly, since I'm no Don Juan either). I don't like them, I never wanted them, and I don't consider myself qualified or sufficiently (ir)responsible to have one. I also wouldn't condemn an innocent to this life unless I could make sure they wouldn't have to live in hell, while all I can guarantee is the opposite.

The way I see it, people reproduce for one or more out of five possible reasons, from the most common to the rarest:

- 1 - By accident, as a side-effect of recreational sex;
- 2 - Because everyone is doing it, and people can't figure out, on their own, what to do with their lives after studying, working, marrying and before dying;
- 3 - Because the woman, who *needs* to have children, forces the man to;
- 4 - To have an heir, so as to make most of a lifetime spent amassing money not to feel like a waste;

5 - And/or to have someone to take care of them when they are old, and to sit by their deathbed so that they don't die alone.

None of those is a valid reason to condemn someone - someone who is *actually* innocent and doesn't get a say in it - to life. None of those motives gets even close to justifying human reproduction.

I've never seen anyone having children to try to make a better human being, to create something superior to themselves. No - doing so is too hard, requiring a fair amount of altruism (or the closest to it we can simulate), careful planning, a lot of time, sincere dedication, and a hefty emotional and financial investment. Instead, people have kids because they were drunk and couldn't unwrap a condom. Or because they had a job (for now), no idea of what to do with the rest of their lives, and their neighbors just had their second baby.

For starters, if you have an IQ above 120 (not to set the bar too high), at least three million dollars in your bank account, average or above height and appearance (because beauty is somewhat hereditary and it does play a relevant role in happiness), and no genetic diseases, you might *consider* having kids. If you don't qualify, for all that is sacred please don't have any, because you have no reason to do so other than to antagonize the entire human race, ruin your own life, destroy an innocent one and waste limited natural resources. We need far less people in this world, not even more.

If you do fit the description above, make sure you also *want* to have children, or at least that you don't hate them. Don't do it just because your wife, lover or girlfriend wants a breathing toy and you caved to her nagging. Having a kid is (or should be) a full-time job and, as with anything else, you won't be good at it if you don't like what you are doing. Leaving your kid in a daycare or school is not "raising a child" - that's *delegating* it, and to people who have no stakes whatsoever in, or responsibility for, how your kid will turn out. (We should call it "day *don't* care" instead.)

Once the mother of your future child gets pregnant, nothing else matters. Every single time one of you messes up during the following nine months - especially in the last seven, when the brain is in frantic development (up to 250,000 neurons being created per minute) - will maim your offspring for life. Quit your job, if with three million dollars or more stashed away for some reason you still have one (if you are not willing to abandon your career, don't have a baby). Whatever your wife wants to do during her pregnancy, make it happen. Anything you can come up with to make these *the* best

nine months of her entire life, do it. Even if you hate the woman, remember: you are doing it for the kid, not [just] her. And you have no reason to dislike that one yet (even though the child already has plenty to dislike *you*. They just don't know it yet).

The fetus' brain chemistry is deeply tied to the state of their mother's during pregnancy. However she feels during that period is directly tied to how your kid will feel for their *entire life* (unless something drastic happens, which can only make things even worse; never better). And if you break your child before they are born, there's no way to unbreak them later.

For that same reason, when your wife tells you she is pregnant, *lie*. Say, "That's some next-level shit, babe!" Don't go with, "I knew it! You fucking whore! Who's the father?!" Feel free to think that, hire a PI and/or look up abortion clinics, but don't say or do any of that in front of her. If those are the first things that come to your mind though, you probably already ruined everything. And if that's the case, you should indeed encourage and help your wife/girlfriend/hookup in carrying out an abortion. And you should remain by her side afterward, for however long it takes for her to feel better, because *you* screwed up her life and hormonal balance (assuming you are indeed the child's father [There, there. That's enough. Stop praying that you aren't – it won't help]).

If you end up actually having a baby, once this one is born your *only* job will be to take good care of them, and for many years to come, because they cannot do so on their own.

Having a child, keep in mind that *today* is more important than tomorrow. As time passes, their potential dwindles and the harder it is to fix any harm that has befallen them in the past.

Once your kid turns 12, they will finally *start thinking* and you won't have much control over them anymore. By the way, I think that's why every teenager is constantly angry: thanks to the neurological changes our brains suffer at that age, when we turn 12 we finally begin to understand that human existence is trash, that life is all about money and sex, that we have no idea of how to get either, and that we'll have to spend most of our lives studying and working like slaves, against our will and for no good reason, while we patiently wait for a terrible death to befall us, when we'll finally lose everything we have ever achieved, painfully and forever, in exchange for most likely literally nothing. We can't really fault teenagers for being pissed. It takes a few years for resignation to settle in.

Once your “baby” turns 25, their brain will be completely formed, there’ll be nothing more you can do, and everything except their wisdom (with some luck) will only go downhill after that. Only then will your job be finished.

If you did everything right, one day your grown child will do the same. If you didn’t, once they [accidentally] have their own kids you’ll feel compelled to directly intervene, in a desperate attempt to try to get things right this second time around, now using someone else’s children as guinea pigs. This is what it means to be a grandparent.

I won’t tell you how exactly to raise your child because I’m mostly aware of what must be *avoided* (got a couple decades of first-hand experience with this). But you should know that it’s possible to deliberately increase their IQ by a very large margin (about 60 points, I’ve *heard*) with proper raising, and you should also keep in mind that being smart is essential (for everyone’s sake) but not their only necessity – if your kid turns out a genius, that’s great; but you must also make sure they are good in other areas. Being a nerd will guarantee them a terrible life, with good chances of it ending in suicide (the smarter someone is the higher the odds of this happening are, since it *is* the most logical thing to do for any person stuck living among apes).

I’d suggest teaching a child to read and write when they are 3 years old, then keep pushing them some age-appropriate books afterward so that they acquire a taste for reading. And start teaching them how to *program* when they are 5 or 6 – soon, human beings will have no practical use other than to write code (*if* this much), and being able to hack/invoke electronic systems is likely going to become the most useful skill for one to have. Also, coding is pure reasoning and involves a lot of math, so there’s literally nothing better to develop a child’s intelligence. And teach your kid to box as well, because punching someone hard in the face is the most effective way to solve some 90% of problems.

We are over eight billion at the moment and not even Earth itself can handle so many of us. We no longer need to reproduce in large numbers, because we are [supposed to be] perfectly capable of choosing *quality* over quantity. We can make sure every child develops well rather than making a thousand of them hoping that

one might turn out “okay,” as humans have been doing since we exist.

Basically, have a child if you are intellectually, financially, morally and emotionally capable of, and also willing to put some real effort (yourself, *directly*) into raising a better human being. Otherwise, just live your life until it ends and enjoy it as much as you can without dragging anyone else unwillingly into this mess. You’ll be doing much better for yourself while also indirectly helping every other living being on this planet.

If you are unqualified and/or unprepared, having a child is one of the worst things you can possibly do with your life.

The main objective, here, is not necessarily for us to have a whole species of geniuses. That’s secondary, since we also need (or “theoretically want”) people with a plethora of other talents and many of these don’t necessarily require high intelligence in the strict sense of the word. Also, I’ve read (if I’m not mistaken, in one of Einstein’s biography, whose author seemed to be a pretty smart guy) that the smarter someone is, the *less creative* they are.

Intellectually and strictly speaking, I’d say what we need is to have an entire population with an IQ above 120 because, according to my personal experience, that seems to be the minimum required for someone to be able to think independently, to doubt everyone and try to understand everything on their own while achieving at least *some* level of success. For the sake of maintaining our creativity, the “ideal” (the best we might *currently* be able to achieve, even though it might leave us lacking on both accounts) would be for our species to have an average IQ of 140 (I’ve mentioned this before but I’ll repeat it anyway: the current average is 82).

All humans must be able to assess facts on their own and understand at least the *basics* of how our existence works. Those who cannot do so, who for one reason or another cannot deal with reality as it is, are just pebbles in humanity’s shoes – pebbles that magically come together to form a noose around its neck.

If you have children, you don’t really have to raise a super-human. A decent one is enough, for now. But for this to be possible, you first need to be at least decent yourself.

Do you know why we begin to rot at the age of 25?

Because we *reproduce too soon*.

I read in a book that, if people reproduced later on in their lives, our genome would develop to keep us “young” for longer. Since most people procreate before they are even 25, by this age our genetic code is programmed to start deteriorating because our main directive has, in most cases, already been fulfilled by then.

You can enjoy your life more, raise your children better, and contribute to one day making people stay younger for considerably longer, *all at once*, by simply reproducing later on in your life.

But we don’t do that. According to a sociologist I once heard speaking on the TV, people with a *higher* education have, on average, two children per couple and reproduce at the age of 24, while people with a *lower* education have, on average, four children per couple and reproduce at the age of 16 (!!!). (These numbers vary on a country by country basis, but they always follow the same pattern.)

The reproduction pattern of the first group mentioned is bad: too many children (enough to maintain the human population, which must dwindle), way too early. The second group’s is an unmitigated disaster.

Ideally, people should [currently] reproduce when they are between 35 and 40 years old and have no more than a single child, which is far from what even the most educated among us tend to do (it’s worth remembering that “educated” and “intelligent” are not the same thing).

Regardless of the ideal, there are two things we can extract from those numbers I mentioned: obviously, one is that more enlightened people have fewer children than ignorant ones; and the second is that the latter is naturally bound to, numerically, overcome the first. And that means we are headed in the exact opposite direction to the one we should be heading. It means we will *always* be heading in such a direction unless we actually *do* something about it.

Once the most ignorant people form the majority of a society, this one is doomed (especially in a democracy). Once they form the majority of our species, humanity is. The “good” news is that this has always been the case – being doomed is all that we, so far, have ever

known. This fact doesn't bother us nearly as much as it should simply because we think it's *normal*.

We have a highly explosive mixture in our hands: a very poor genetic mass combined with widespread ignorance. In the West, we have a democratic system on top of that, meaning we also have the worst kind of people controlling the guns, limiting our freedom and making decisions that negatively affect us all.

But here is the saddest part of it all: if you have a child *and* successfully raise them properly, gifting the human race with a healthy, well-meaning, intelligent and capable person, you will automatically be condemning your own kid to live in a world far, *far* below their own standards. They'll be stuck with billions of people they have no reason to help or respect, and infinite ones to despise. And that creates a near-paradox, because the only way to improve things is for good people to multiply, but they are the ones with the least reasons to do so. The right thing to do is to condemn a superior being to live among their inferiors, which is wrong. (This is a "near-paradox" because it can be solved: the solution is to exterminate all the undesirable people *first*. Once these are gone, the desirable ones have reason to reproduce.)

The way I see it, we have two ways out of our current, dire predicament:

- 1 - To multiply decent people *faster* than the others, which can only be done in places where they are still the majority of the population or where they are not yet a *tiny* minority (I'm being generous with the definition of "decent" here, otherwise no such place would currently exist). This means we'd have a *few countries* with a civilized population, which should lead to them easily surpassing all others economically and technologically. Once this happens, their peoples could either leave Earth and settle elsewhere, or reclaim the planet by destroying every other nation on it;

- 2 - Or, once again, to hinder or entirely halt bad peoples' reproduction, forcing them to reproduce less than the good ones or, far better, to not reproduce at all, until they are eventually extinct (which requires no suffering on their part and takes only the span of one generation to fully achieve).

Both of those paths may lead to peace, progress and evolution, but the first one has a considerable chance of failing and, even if it

doesn't, it still requires us undergoing a long-lasting phase of nationalism, segregation and wars, leading to a lot of suffering that can and should be avoided.

Refusing to adopt either of those two options will eventually lead to our species' demise. So we're left with the second one.

Since I have been talking about children, there are two more things I'd like to mention about them:

One is that, since we all inevitably go through a young phase of utmost ignorance, every human being is bound to make mistakes and to harm others before we eventually learn how *not* to do so. We are born as imbeciles, we all have a past, and none of us can possibly ever be unsoiled, pure, *entirely* good. (All we can do is to forgive our own past mistakes and deliberately try to do better in the future.)

The second thing is that, whether in movies or in real life, whenever a crisis is going on we always hear people yelling, "Save the children!" When reporting on wars and other tragedies, the news always emphasize their casualty numbers over adults'. When begging for money, humanitarian organizations show their starving faces on our screens instead of their even skinnier parents' bodies.

The way movies, politicians and the media consider children is nonsensical. They ignore reason, appealing to the audience's emotions instead (which qualifies them all as sensationalist demagogues).

In any life-or-death crisis, children should be our *lowest* priority, and not the highest, because they are *useless*. If a child dies, no knowledge is lost and no task is rendered impossible to be realized. Among all, they are the least important people. Our highest priority should be to save men aged 20-50 and women aged 20-40 (due to fertility rates). Those are the useful ones, the people who already know something, who can still learn more, who can apply and/or teach any of it, and who can easily make more children, on demand or at a whim.

The notion that children should be prioritized falsely implies that all adults are *less* worthy than them. To say "Save the children!" is the same as to say "Forget the adults!" It's the same as to say "Let's gamble on them being successful one day, because *we all failed*."

If we act upon the assumption that we are all worthless idiots who have completely failed in our lives (however often this may actually be true), this creates another paradox, because those yelling “Save the children!” are, according to themselves, worthless. If that’s the case, why should anyone listen to them? And if we have indeed all failed, our children are bound to as well, because we have also already failed to raise them properly.

So, the next time a tsunami comes your way, *abandon* the children (unless they are your own). And the elderly. Save yourself instead – you are worth more than any them.

(That’s the logical thing to do but, to be honest, now that I think of it, I’d probably go for the baby in the burning crib too if I ever found myself in a burning house. Sadly, I’m still human.)

Hold on to Your Wallet

There’s another very simple thing you can do to help improve our collective existence. You don’t need to form a cabal and devise a long-term plan to infiltrate and take over your country’s government, bribe the press, and spend decades convincing a new generation of people that what is right is, indeed, right. No – that’s what socialists do (except that they substitute one of the “rights” I just said for a “wrong”).

As a common citizen who has “better” things to do with their time, you can simply *stop giving money to those you don’t agree with*.

In practice, that means switching channels on your TV when a movie or commercial comes in which a black man is paired with a white woman; not going to the cinema to watch movies in which a woman, as the protagonist, emasculates and humiliates [exclusively white] men on every opportunity she gets; not buying any product whose commercials show as many gay people as can be fit into a single camera shot.

Don’t watch or purchase anything that violates your own values, regardless of whether you agree with me on the examples I provided above or not. If you *do* agree with those, though, it’s even more important that you heed my suggestion, as this is the only means we currently have of “being heard.”

If you switch channels when an advertisement or a movie scene encouraging practices you are morally against shows up, you are effectively not giving money to the people who profit from it. If a TV channel notices that their audience is dropping and that they are getting poorer, they will care. If they start caring, they will change. And if what you see on the TV (or on YouTube and the such, for that matter) changes, our society as a whole does, because the majority of people blindly abide by whatever they see and hear in it.

If anything you find offensive shows up in your telly, turn it off. Get your news elsewhere. Walk out of the cinema and refund your ticket. Buy different shoes. Get drunk on something other than Heineken or Jack Daniel's. Eat healthier food, drive a more economic car, and cut yourself while shaving with a Chinese razor, get tetanus and die if you have to. Go to sleep or spend hours staring at the ceiling if you are left with nothing to watch or do. Just don't give money to the people who are trying to destroy what you believe is right and the collective human society along with it (assuming your "heart" is in the right place).

Most people are not gay. Most people (outside Africa) are not black. Most people *are* women (because men kill each other more often), but they are not better or more important than men. And yet anyone who turns their TV on these days is led to believe 90% of the human race is comprised by black gay women, that they discovered everything we know, invented everything we have, created the world as it is and are now entitled to rule it.

You can help correct our ways. Anyone can. Just keep the remote control close at hand and stop buying products from companies whose sole purpose is to accumulate enough money for their executives to afford watching the world they set on fire burn from the sky, as they sip champagne and laugh at Armageddon inside the Sikorsky-92 we bought for them.

It may already be too late to make a meaningful difference, since people have been being brainwashed in multiple wrong directions for decades, rendering the current and the next two or three consecutive human generations to take power insane – our children's and young adults' moral, civic and societal values have been upended, their understanding of the past doesn't quite tell how we got to where we are, their view of the present doesn't correspond to the world as it is, and they'll fail in creating the future they imagine in their crippled, censored minds because their reasoning is not based on valid principles or actual facts.

If you follow my advice, you'll be doing what is right just for the sake of it. It's for the greater good, not your own. It's for your childrens' children, not for you.

Despite being a small thing, switching channels and refraining from consuming certain products is pretty much the best the average [truly] Western person can do nowadays without risking what little freedom we still have left.

Since that was rather common advice and these topics are supposed to be interesting, helpful or both, I'll give you a bonus:

Never purchase products that are *advertised* anywhere.

When a company invests in marketing and publicity, it passes on these costs to customers. When you buy that company's products or services, part of what you pay goes to cover such investments, meaning you pay *extra* to get literally nothing out of it – you pay extra for the *brand*, which has no actual value whatsoever. You pay more exclusively to make filthy-rich people even richer and yourself poorer.

Next time you go to the supermarket, navigate the aisles, find the first item in your shopping list, then check what lies on the shelf around it. You'll see the product you always purchase – the one that is advertised all the time on the TV – and, right next to it, a bunch of others that are almost the same, identical, or possibly even better than it, all from brands you never heard about and all cheaper than the one you've always paid a premium for. Throw any one of these other products into your cart instead of the one you usually buy. Then do the same with every other item in your shopping list. You'll save yourself a lot of money, help society fight off monopolies, potentially discover better products than the ones you always consumed, make a bunch of psychopaths poorer, aid smaller and more honest (or “less dishonest”) businessmen, and make the whole world a little bit better. *That* is a good deal.

The only upside of buying something by/from a multi-billion-dollar brand is that for once you know, for sure, that you are paying *far more* for it than it's actually worth.

Good Old News

In a way, this topic can be considered as the other side of the previous one, because it focuses on what we *should* watch or read.

It took me a while to appreciate the importance of journalists. Of *good* journalists – those who seek the truth, stick to facts, and save their private opinions for themselves. Those who investigate complex issues, connect the dots and reveal conspiracies; who risk their lives to cover a war from the frontlines, denounce illegal practices and crimes against humanity, or otherwise dedicate their careers to elucidating instead of fooling the public.

The other ones are despicable.

You have probably seen at least one movie about reporters investigating governmental cover-ups, corrupt congressmen, criminal organizations, mass espionage schemes, rapist priests, etc. Some of those movies are pure fiction, while others are based on real stories. In the second case, it's always hard to tell where the truth ends and the fiction begins, since movies are deliberately over-dramatized. But many scandals *have* been made public thanks to serious and ethical journalism, leading to some malpractice being revealed, its effects mitigated and, sometimes, to those responsible for it even being underpunished (which is the best our institutional “justice” can do when someone is actually guilty).

A doctor may save a life. A soldier may kill a hundred enemies while defending his country. A policeman can take down a criminal before this one hurts someone. A fireman can rescue people from a burning building or a cat from a tree. An engineer can build a dam and provide entire cities with electricity. An electronic one can add eight more gigabytes of disk space to a smartphone. But when a journalist does their job right, they can spare us all from *being harmed*. They are the people we should actually “thank you for your service.”

By seeking the truth and reporting facts, good journalists can save us from terrible scenarios. By ignoring facts and reporting their opinions, bad ones *create* them, because any distortion of the truth viewed by all will be assimilated by many, who will then think and act upon lies, having unreasonable opinions, behaving illogically and treating others unfairly.

When something shows up on the TV, we assume everyone has seen and believed in it – as I've said before, that becomes the

“perceived/assumed public opinion,” and this is what congressmen, CEOs, judges and others with power take into account. It’s based on this assumption that laws are written, policies adopted, products created and marketed, and even some court decisions taken.

I cannot speak for the whole world since each country has its own history. But ask yourself this: how many times has a bill been passed, or not, in your Congress thanks to revelations made by the press? How many criminals have been caught? How many factory-flawed products were recalled? How much corruption has come to light? How many presidents were impeached or prime ministers forced to resign?

And how many laws were written and decrees enacted based on what the *TV says*, instead of on what you and everyone you know *actually* want and believe in?

What journalists do matters a lot because, in practice, our representatives act as if TV channels and newspapers spoke for us. They act as if the media actually represents the population’s will (which is ironic, since that’s precisely our representatives’ job). To a large extent, it is the media that decides our future, and not those we elect to do so.

If we focus our attention on the work of good journalists and encourage them (financially), human society improves. If we fall prey to the bad ones (who must never be paid), it erodes. So be careful about where you get your news from. If they sound too far-fetched, they are probably fake; if they sound too one-sided, they are probably biased. And if what you’ve been hearing or reading *often* sounds one way or the other, you need to find a better source of information as soon as possible.

The fact that journalists, these days, no longer make a lot of money is a problem.

Seeking and finding the truth, especially when it’s well hidden and most needed, is expensive. Journalists need microphones, computers, cameras, recorders, helmets, bullet proof vests, lawyers. They need to travel, to spend time, and to put thought and effort into their tasks. They need to meet sources, pay bribes, break into places, tour battled frontlines, locate, visit and interview people, discover what happened, find proof, understand the situation and convey it clearly to everyone else. And they also need to eat.

It's like they say: "If you want good journalism, pay for it." After all, "you get what you pay for." People are not encouraged to, and in fact cannot do a good job if they are not rewarded [at least] fairly for their work.

Nowadays, thanks to the workings and consequences of the internet, real journalists rely heavily on *donations* to get by. Since printed copies of newspapers are no longer a thing, and filling their websites with ads would tend to bias their work (due to a need to draw in and please advertisers) and also discredit it (since by now we all instinctively know that the more advertisements a website has, the more unreliable it is), we must *choose* to pay them.

Those of us who can understand what I'm saying and can afford to do so must encourage ethical journalism. We must assign to it its fair value and pay for it, because the rest of humanity won't. If we don't, true journalism will die, we'll be left without a single reliable source of information, and none of us will ever know the truth about anything again, leaving those in power where they stand and myriad necessary changes forever unimplemented.

In the interest of full disclosure, I must say that I, myself and hypocritically, *don't* usually donate anything to newspapers. That's because I don't trust any of my country's journals and TV channels, I haven't read or watched any of them in over a decade (due to the fact that I live in a hopeless country fated to self-destruction), I'm not a rich man, and because donating to foreign journals can only be done via credit card, which I don't have, or other means I do not use. And also because if I donated anything to newspapers based in other countries, they'd only receive about 15% of what I actually gave them thanks to currency exchange rates. Nonetheless, I did recently donate \$100 (as a reference, the minimum wage here is \$1.400) to Wikipedia, because they finally made a payment method viable to me available. The Wikimedia Foundation is not formed by journalists and it doesn't deliver news, but it's a non-profit organization that maintains a database of information that I've used many times, so I helped them a bit once I could.

One might wonder: what if we end up donating *more* than journalists actually need or deserve?

That's not a problem, because if we are assisting decent people, that extra money will simply go into hiring more journalists which, in turn, will lead to more facts that might have gone unnoticed being made public. In the worst case scenario, we'd be making useful

people's lives more comfortable than they "should" be, which is fine. The real problem is not donating *enough*.

If you are someone who can tell truth from lies, facts from opinions, and who can afford to contribute to those who work honestly and even risk themselves to bring us all accurate, unbiased information, do consider doing it. You are their, and by extension our, only hope.

If you are not that kind of person, do the world a favor and keep *not* paying for whatever bullshit service you usually get "enlightened" by. Just make sure you block their ads and cookies, so that they at least won't profit from poisoning your mind, twisting your reality and manipulating you into ruining everyone else's.

In the United States, they used to have the *Fairness Doctrine* in place, which obligated all their broadcasters to present the audience with different points of view on any issue. But eventually, due to political pressure (as an extension of a financial one), that doctrine was revoked and their media was once again allowed to manipulate their viewers indiscriminately.

Several different American congressmen have been trying to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine since the early 2000s, but so far to no avail. Without it, the Americans have essentially been left with Fox News on one side and CNN on the other. Redneck, pro-gun, inbred nationalists watch one, while black people, Mexicans, homosexuals and junkies watch the other. And that doesn't simply *show* the segregation in the American society - those channels' biased productions and deliveries *create* it.

There's this thing called "common sense" which we are all supposed to have. We should all be able to agree with each other at least on *some* things. When faced with a simple problem and presented with clear facts, everyone is supposed to see the same obvious solution. But to see it we need those facts, as even the wisest among us cannot reach the right conclusion based on lies or without the whole truth.

With numerous "free" news outlets out there, most people nowadays can't even find a proper source of information. Naturally, we go to those that agree with our personal views because these are much *easier* to read, watch or listen to - we don't need to think or stress ourselves with the other group's "retarded political views" when listening exclusively to our own. But when we read something that

was written *to* agree with us, any fact that goes against our beliefs is deliberately omitted from it. And if we are wrong, we'll remain wrong, because we won't even know that us being so is a *possibility*.

What happens, in practice and without something like the Americans' Fairness Doctrine in place, is that "people A" keep reading or listening to "news A" because this one only repeats what they already know, reinforcing what they believe in and omitting any facts that may lead them to think things over and potentially change their minds. As "news A" keeps omitting handpicked facts and showing a single perspective as if it were the only one available, "people A" are kept oblivious to the true reality of things. They are kept unaware of anything they don't *want* to know, which in turn "proves" them right. Again! – strangely, they are *always* right.

On the other side, we have "people B" reading or listening to "news B," which conceals different facts from those "news A" does, showing only the *opposite* perspective to its audience, leading "people B" to believe their opinions, diametrically opposed to "people A's," are just as "always right" as "people A" believe theirs are.

If two opposite sides are absolutely sure they are right, they are also absolutely sure the other one is wrong. If the other side is surely wrong, we can only *hate* them. If we hate them, we don't talk to but instead criticize, insult and fight them. And here we have populism in action once again, and society destroying itself as a consequence.

With biased "journalism" we get a biased and polarized society. What we have now, in the Western World, is two antagonist groups fighting each other: "left" and "right." And the worst part is that everyone is screwed if *either one* of them wins, because they are both wrong thanks to neither side ever taking reason and reality, as a whole and as it truly is, into consideration.

The "good" news is that both sides are unlikely to ever achieve any kind of meaningful victory, because the division is fairly close to 50/50 – which is the ideal ratio for those pulling the strings and seeding chaos. The bad news is that, thanks to that division, shit keeps constantly hitting the fan. And every time it does, it flies into *everyone's* faces.

Just to sum it up, in case I diverted too much from my original point: journalists are on the frontline of either keeping civil society together or tearing it apart, respectively via sharing facts or opinionated half-truths ("Just like you [me, the author] have been

doing!” someone reading this is bound to say). It’s up to them to discover and let us all know about those who are trying to destroy our lives and, without knowing about this, none of us can do anything about it.

We can’t let ourselves forget the importance of journalism. We *need* journalists, and they need us back – so, once again, do pay them if you can afford to.

As a parallel point, there’s an interesting thing about the news themselves. In particular, about the *bad* things that happen and get aired.

As I have already stressed, we are deeply flawed beings. Every day people commit horrible atrocities all over the world. Collectively, we elect conmen and clowns to run our countries, leading to criminal laws being enacted, the global economy being mismanaged, justice being forfeited and our core moral values being perverted. As a consequence of all that, whenever we watch or read the news we are overwhelmed by a series of sickening events, becoming aware that we live among people who are entirely unfit to share a planet with others. And albeit only slightly, we do empathize with the victims of the crimes we are watching or reading about. We do *feel* a bit of their pain, even if only due to realizing that what happened to them might eventually happen to ourselves.

When getting up to date with current events, we also learn that a new bill that has just been approved in Congress will limit our rights while increasing someone else’s, violating Constitutional principles. We see the president we voted for signing a decree that will favor some of his personal friends at our expense, taking bribes to lower tariffs, or ordering direct attacks against countries that never harmed us. We listen to our representatives saying nothing but ill-considered platitudes, then acting contrary to their campaigning promises. And whenever any crisis arises, we invariably find out that none of the people we each pay a fortune to sustain anticipated or were prepared for it.

Whenever we see the news, it *pisses us off* because there’s hardly ever anything other than disgrace in them. It’s the exact same thing, every single day, since the day we were born to this very one, and it will remain the same until the day we die. “Getting pissed off” means we get *stressed* which, in turn, means our bodies release some

adrenaline and, most importantly, cortisol and other stress-related hormones into our bloodstreams. And some of those substances are *toxic* – they effectively harm our whole bodies.

Cortisol kills cells of the human hippocampus. It inhibits protein synthesis in our muscles. It blocks the absorption of calcium by our bones. It causes skin problems, stomach ones, and it's harmful to our hearts. It increases our blood pressure, leads to strokes, can cause anxiety, depression and headaches. Basically, every time our bodies release cortisol, we *die* a little. And every time we watch the news, some of it is produced by and circulated in our bodies.

When any single atrocity gets aired, it ends up negatively affecting hundreds of millions of people. If, for instance, one man murders his entire family with a bubble wrap sheet and a hundred million people hear about it, each one of these ends up being biologically affected. Whenever an act is bad enough to make it into the news, on top of the damage done by the act itself it also makes millions of people slightly stupider, slightly weaker, slightly sicker. Each such act effectively takes a few minutes, hours, or even days out of millions of lives at once.

Thanks to radio waves and the internet, despicable actions that throughout human history only affected a few now affect many. Although any evil deed has always generated a cascade of negative consequences, indirectly affecting everyone, now it *directly* affects us all. And the worst part is that even if justice is eventually done, if the damage is repaired, a bad project canceled or an idiotic notion abandoned, the effects of the stress caused to millions of people when the condemnable act or cogitation was made public remains. There's no taking it back. That damage is *permanently* done – a considerable amount of it, every day, to all of us.

That is an all-encompassing, biological and direct consequence of harming others. It's a reason why now, more than ever before, we should avoid doing so.

Finally, as another tangent point: you have probably noticed I previously mentioned the journal *The Guardian* as a source multiple times, particularly in the topic "Arabs Vs. Jews," and this is because I have been getting all my war news from it. I've been raised as a "right-wing guy," always stood by the United States and Israel against the Arabs because this is what my TV and those closest to me

did and, still, after the Gaza massacre began, it took me less than 48 hours to diametrically switch my political stance on this matter, and not for a second did I ever feel an inkling to switch back since. So I asked myself: given that *The Guardian* is recognized for having a slight left-wing inclination, have I been subtly manipulated by it during these past few years?

I sought an answer and, according to Microsoft's Copilot, during its Gaza war coverage *The Guardian* not only didn't avoid publishing anything that might have favored Israel or harmed the Palestinians (thus something that might have induced me toward the instance I have now adopted), but it actually did slightly the *opposite*: the journal has "omitted" (there's no indication this was done deliberately; just a natural happenstance of the news business) three "minor" occurrences related to the war: two about further censorship being applied in Germany under the guise of antisemitism, and one about yet another anti-Palestinian law being ratified in Israel. On top of that, it was detected that *The Guardian* uses softer language when reporting on Israel's genocidal actions by using passive verbs when referring to Arab deaths - these are always "killed" or simply "died," while they actively "murder" and "massacre" their victims.

We have two important points here. One is that the language used is a subtle way to manipulate the reader, widely used by major news vehicles with the deliberate intent of swaying the audience to one particular side. The other is that even *The Guardian* - a traditional and globally respected British journal - is influenced by and afraid of Israeli persecution, having to tread very carefully not to have its own journalists and editors falsely accused of antisemitism.

It's almost unbelievable how far Israel's evil tendrils have been allowed to reach and how much of the Western organism they have infected and crippled. Nonetheless, *my* view of things seem to be uncompromised. So you can take what I said back in "Arabs Vs. Jews" at face value, because I probably *did* get most of it right.

False Idols

Have you ever noticed that, when someone dies, they immediately become saints?

Watching the news, you learn that some criminal has been shot down and killed by the police. He tried but didn't have enough time to fire the loaded weapon he had on him, so the police's conduct is being questioned. As the criminal's family is being interviewed, you hear them say, "He was such a good boy! He never harmed anyone, had a lot of friends, and we all loved him so, so much!" Yeah, right. His past seven convictions must have all been wrong, and those thirty shot-through packs of cocaine he had strapped around his waist, now soaked in his blood, surely have been planted or at the very least were meant for his own medicinal use. And that old lady he ran over with a stolen car when fleeing from the police is doing fine by the way – because she's dead now.

I find it funny that not only do we deny all the harm we or those close to us cause, but also seek to immediately absolve ourselves, or them, as soon as any of us dies. And afterward, we forge a fake mental picture of the dead person, much prettier than their life and deeds were, to remember them by.

That reminds me of a book I was once gifted by a cousin of mine, called *The Politically Incorrect Guide to History* (a literal translation; I'm not sure if that's the actual title in English). As its title implies, that book reveals a few deliberately hidden facts of human history, a couple of which I'll share now.

The following are *spoilers* if you intend to read the book yourself and I may misremember small details, but the general gist of things is correct.

We are all familiar with Gandhi, of course – the wise and peaceful Indian leader and Nobel Peace Prize nominee. As it turns out, he was also gay and simply abandoned his wife and children for several years to go live with a German architect/bodybuilder. Someone found the love letters they exchanged.

Also, if you think about it, despite having freed his country from the British – which *sounds* like a good thing – what Gandhi actually left his people, as his legacy, was the "poor man's mentality" that strongly steered India towards becoming (or "remaining") the overcrowded and rather miserable country it is today.

The more any British colony absorbed from their imperialist ruler's culture, the better they developed. Unlike Spain, Portugal and others, England seems to have mostly chosen to colonize instead of exclusively exploit its new territories. And by forcing the British law,

culture and mentality upon the people they conquered, the British helped them develop far more than they could or would have on their own. Look at the United States, compared to South American countries; at South Africa (despite the Apartheid and everything else), compared to the rest of its continent; or at Singapore, compared to [most of] China.

So, besides being secretly gay and abandoning his family, in the long-term Gandhi actually did his country a great disservice. And people worship him nonetheless.

Mother Teresa was beatified. She also managed many millions of dollars in donations, and refused to spend them to treat her patients.

The book I mentioned tells a story shared by one of the nurses who worked directly for Teresa about a boy aged 15 who came under her care. He sought help because he had cancer, couldn't afford to treat it, was in great pain and wouldn't live for much longer if he didn't receive adequate treatment. When that boy came to Teresa, she had, if memory serves me right, about twenty million dollars' worth of donations stashed away. And what did she do?

She refused to pay for the boy's treatment. She even refused to give him *painkillers* because, according to her, "pain brings us closer to Jesus." The boy was left untreated and *agonized for two weeks* in mother Teresa's ward before dying.

They should have exorcised, and not beatified that greedy, demented hag.

Going beyond the book: Napoleon apparently was, like so many others, a psychopath, and also a cuckold. Einstein was wrong about quantum physics, and he slept with his wife's daughter. Bill Clinton had Monica Lewinsky. Donald Trump nearly managed to lose the half a billion dollars daddy handed down to him, he has been convicted on thirty four counts of falsifying business records, was found liable of sexual abuse and defamation, currently faces four more criminal charges, and he greatly enjoys being both Putin's and Netanyahu's bitch at the same time.

If we look close enough at any famous and/or historical figure, we are bound to find out that every single one of them was just as human as the rest of us. And in the worst possible sense.

Our Social Selves

I'm sorry, but I cannot let it slide - I *have* to say something about "social networking."

The internet revealed the sad state of humanity's mental affairs. Reading posts on social networks, reviews on IMDb, YouTube comments, forum discussions or pretty much anything else written by "free posters," we can tell that the vast majority of the human race is semi-illiterate. By the way one writes it's possible to tell how they think, and it became blatantly clear that most of us are very stupid, if not literally retarded. We don't know what to say, how to say it or when to shut up. We cannot tell apart a child's rambling from an adult's opinion, so we take them equally into account. We assess the quality of our own personal opinions and ideas by the amount of "thumbs ups" we receive from random strangers who have even lower standards than our own.

Top-viewed videos on YouTube range from silly infantilism to brain-damage idiocy, with semi-pornographic pop music videos sprinkled in between, and TikTok users somehow manage to create even worse content. Clowns with nothing relevant to say, speaking about something they don't understand and talking as if addressing children with Down syndrome have risen to the dangerous status of "influencers." Being a "blogger" is considered an actual profession. Not satisfied by giving away their personal information for free, billions of people freely yield their private conversations as well, seemingly unaware of the old adage, "everything you say can and *will* be used against you."

Russians have developed "deepfakes." Now, AIs can forge people doing and saying things they never did, and even the most enlightened among us can no longer trust their own eyes and ears when seeing and hearing anything on/from a screen. Elections have been cheated and shifted using fake news, social networks and the private data mined by these. Teenagers commit suicide for not receiving enough "likes" on a "selfie." Girls post pictures of themselves using filters/algorithms that make them all look much prettier and alike, hoping the entire world is foolish enough to believe that is, indeed, their true appearance. Unintelligent people

read and believe in biased news generated/alterd by manipulative code written by unethical companies, or blatantly false ones written by immoral individuals with ulterior agendas or simply in dire need of attention. Most of us cannot tell forged facts from minimally plausible ones, and we won't bother checking the information we receive either. Experiments are being openly conducted to determine how much bullshit people can swallow if spoonfed via social media, and the conclusion was unsurprising: as much as they are given.

The world is doomed.

Okay, that's where we currently stand. Instead of making us wiser, this tool (the internet) that makes most of the human knowledge available to anyone, anywhere, at all times, ended up mostly parading our ignorance and disseminating poorly written lies and uneducated, irrelevant opinions. It sucks, the so-called "Gen Z" seems to be an entirely wasted generation of human beings, and we can only hope that, against impossible odds, they won't make things even worse for future ones.

But let's turn all that bitching into something useful. I read (in *Homo Deus*, if I'm not mistaken) that we, humans, cannot sustain a social circle of more than one hundred and fifty people or so. It's usually around fifteen, twenty-five tops. Anything beyond that is extraordinary. A candidate running for the presidency of the United States probably has about fifty friends (rough guess). And that's fairly obvious, since no one has the time and patience to, or interest in dealing with dozens or hundreds of people on a regular basis. If time and attention were equally dedicated to each one of too many relationships, it would be insufficient for any of them to be considered relevant in any way. The net result would be zero - nothing but a complete waste of time.

So here's a tip: when you see someone with three hundred "friends" on Facebook or Instagram (if you use those things, which no one should), you can automatically infer that that person is a needy fool. They go to great lengths to make people think they are cool and have a lot of friends, because they aren't and don't. In the best case scenario they are just another drug-dealer, as these are everywhere and indeed very popular these days.

If you want to have any kind of constructive interaction with someone over the internet, look for people with no more than twenty five "friends." The *less* the merrier.

Two Kinds of People

There are two kinds of people in this world: psychotics and psychopaths. And then there's the rest of us.

Psychotics are people who have hallucinations. Russell Crowe's character in *A Beautiful Mind* is an example (of a rather severe case). Though psychosis is a serious condition, those who have it aren't really more prone to harming others than the rest of us.

Psychopaths, on the other hand, are deprived of empathy. They are absolutely selfish people who couldn't possibly care less about anyone other than themselves. They lie, cheat, steal and kill without remorse, believing the entire universe exists for them and for them alone. They are human beings without any of the few things that are good in us, thus being the sickest and most depraved animal we know.

According to *Forbes*, psychopaths are mainly drawn towards becoming businessmen (CEOs), lawyers and media workers¹⁶ (no surprises there). Those are their "Top 3" careers. Other professions preferred by psychopaths include clergyman, police officer, surgeon and civil servant (reason dictates politicians are included among these, though I found no direct mention to them in the articles I read). And, of course, a high number of psychopaths become criminals (a high number of them "gets caught" might be a better way to put it, since they are all criminals).

It's not a coincidence that the professions that focus on, or at least allow people to either destroy others' lives or take advantage of them are filled with psychos. They actively seek to make others suffer.

Psychopaths form about 1% of the human population and more than 15% of the incarcerated one, thus being 17.4 times more likely to commit a crime than a normal person (I had an AI do the math). And it seems fair to assume they never help anyone.

Psychopathy is hereditary, and studies indicate it affects all ethnic groups similarly while being about twice as prevalent in men as it is in women.

¹⁶ **Source:** <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kellyclay/2013/01/05/the-top-10-jobs-that-attract-psychopaths/?sh=456a1f614d80> (Accessed in February, 2024)

The worst among us follow a behavioral pattern, they are identifiable, and they must be *exterminated*.

Nature won't do that for us, because sacrificing others or taking advantage of them to achieve one's goals is one of the easiest ways to [individually] survive in this universe. If we want to get rid of those people – and we definitely do – we must eradicate them ourselves, as usual.

Just for fun: some twenty years ago, I ran into a test allegedly used by the FBI to determine whether someone is a psychopath. I tried it myself and posed it to a few friends of mine. Only one guy, who I have multiple reasons to believe is indeed a psycho, nailed the answer. So, as far as I can tell, the test works.

Here it is:

A young woman's mother died.

While attending her mother's funeral, the woman spotted a man she had never seen before in her life and immediately fell in love with him.

Two weeks later, she murdered her sister.

Question: Why?

To avoid spoiling things before you have a chance to answer the test yourself, I'll provide the psychopath's answer as a footnote¹⁷.

I thought for a minute before answering that and got it wrong. When I told it to two friends, they both thought for a little while, provided different answers, and failed as well. But when I did the test with the guy who I believe is a psychopath, he immediately answered it "correctly." For those who *think* like psychopaths – which qualifies them as such – the answer is completely obvious.

A Mistake

¹⁷ **Answer:** The woman killed her sister to see the man she fell in love with again. Since he attended her mother's funeral, she assumed he would attend her sister's as well. (That's a psychopath's way of thinking: *murdering* someone just to achieve a minor, strictly selfish goal.)

In the Western world, we preach that lives must be saved no matter what. We consider a man's life the most valuable commodity in the entire universe (except for any woman's or child's) and try to protect it at all costs, against all reason, as if this was our species' utmost goal. And this fantastic, misguided notion has the ironical effect of actually *devaluing* the very lives it seeks to protect.

We conduct surgeries that stop people from dying, rendering them unable to eat or use the toilet on their own, forcing those poor folks to be humiliated on a daily basis for the rest of their lives. We heavily drug others, so that they can have a few dozen more heart attacks before they finally kick the bucket. We amputate people's legs, so that they have a great future to look forward to, at waist-level, from a wheelchair. We prohibit abortions, euthanasia and suicide assistance, refusing to kill even those who are begging to die, forcing people to live against their will. We do all we can to preserve life, despite how much *suffering* doing so causes.

If you are a decent person, you carry a gun, our laws are reasonable (so you won't be persecuted for doing what you should), and you run into someone who's in agonizing, incurable pain, what do you do? Do you sit down and listen to their screams while watching them suffer, basking in their agony as you wait however long it takes for them to die? Or do you put a bullet in their head, ending their misery? Which is the right thing to do?

Our governments, media and doctors not only sit back and watch, but they go further: they do everything they can to *perpetuate* people's agony.

Humanity is relevant; humans aren't. So long as there's one man and one woman left alive, so that millions of years of natural evolution's work survives, suffering is what matters above anything else, not human life itself. Our goal is to free ourselves from all pain and agony, not to endure them for longer; it is to improve our quality of life, not to have the largest possible number of people inhabiting Earth. By seeking the first alternatives, we might one day live in [a realistic] paradise. By seeking the second, we'll just end up with more people living in an even worse hell.

By assigning [far] more value to individual human lives than they are actually worth, we've convinced ourselves that nothing justifies taking someone's life. As a consequence, we refuse to kill people that *must* be killed, letting those who exist exclusively to harm others walk freely among us for no reason other than to ruin our own lives.

When we manage to identify, find and nab them, we condemn criminals to jail, where they get to live at the expense of their betters. We sentence wartime traitors, white collar tricksters and rotten politicians to just a few years in prison (if any), despite them having directly stolen from or effectively killed millions of people. And if we rightfully murder someone who deserves to die, to spare the rest of humanity from having to deal with them, we are *punished* for it.

Not killing people who must die is a naive and grave mistake. By overestimating human life and refusing to kill or let die those who should or want to, we simply generate and propagate suffering, globally diminishing humanity's worth.

And that's retarded.

Obsolescence

We, humans, are becoming obsolete. By now AIs can find information, answer questions, write coherent texts, compose songs, drive, detect someone's health condition, predict our behavior and who knows what else, all better than we can.

There's isn't much use left for human beings now - less than ever before. Soon, there will be virtually none. In fact, we are a *single* step away from making our entire species completely useless: all we need to do now is to give AIs bodies, and the human being is done for. And that's actually *great*, because for the first time since we exist we may finally be able to actually live instead of just learn/study, hunt/work, suffer and die, by leaving all of our tasks and chores for AIs to realize. In the near future, every human being might be able to spend their whole life doing what they want instead of what they hate.

But the rise of the AI, while [potentially] solving many problems, may also bring a tsunami of new ones for us to handle. Out of those new problems, one that seems safe to bet on is that the vast majority of human beings will be rendered mentally crippled, and *severely* so. Besides that, any country that opts for artificially maintaining the status quo of its economy by keeping obsolete people unnecessarily

employed instead of rehauling it will be quickly surpassed by those who adapt to this new reality.

In the West, where democracy reigns, we'll have an extraordinarily hard time revisiting our ways. Europe might survive (if Russia doesn't swallow it) because the folks there seem to be more reasonable and open-minded. But the United States, where a good part of the population is conservative, where people still swear over Bibles in court, and where many who are against *any* kind of change are armed (which allows them not to change even when they have to), probably won't.

A full rehaul of the economy is far more easily done in countries with an absolutist regime in place, such as China and Russia, via the forceful imposition of the tyrant's will and the killing of anyone who dares to complain about anything he says or does. Though life in such countries tends to be much worse for everyone, their governments do have a huge advantage in actually managing the nation. They can do anything, and do it fast, while in our democracies we can do almost nothing and even the smallest decisions take months or years to be made.

In the West, once unemployment rates can no longer be artificially controlled, governments are going to go tits up. No one will know what to do, populations will start protesting, and these protests may turn into rioting long before our politicians manage to agree on a [palliative] solution. During the years it's likely going to take for any ill-conceived policy to be adopted on this side of the world, China will already have achieved global hegemony, Russia will be working beside it, and the rest of us under them both.

Soon, wars will be entirely planned and soldiers maneuvered by AIs (this is just a step or two ahead of what Israel catastrophically did in Gaza). Or perhaps we won't even have soldiers anymore – only drones and robots. All it will take then is for *one* person who wants to take something that belongs to others to give the order, and dozens or hundreds of millions of people will be blown up or starved to death. And Earth is *teeming* with people willing to give such orders.

Yay. We have a bright future to look forward to.

But that's all just speculation. For the time being, we who can't do anything about it can still *hope* I'm wrong.

As a second point: as powerful as AIs are, and as much more powerful as they'll soon become, I imagine governments will *prohibit* anyone other than themselves from using or developing [at least some] such algorithms. Our leaders and politicians will communicate with our most advanced AIs, give them orders, misinterpret their outputs, miscarry their commands, and the rest of us will be kept entirely oblivious to all of it. We'll be treated even more like simple numbers on a screen than we already are.

I believe the same thing will happen with quantum computers: I don't think the general population will *ever* have access to them. The most advanced AIs and quantum computers are technologies we have but cannot actually use – they'll be used *on* us, not *by* us.

But the fact is that such technologies' usage has to be limited, controlled and supervised, because if any of them fell into the hands of a *single* one of the eighty million or so psychopaths we have around, or into the hands of any of the billions of imbeciles we are inexorably stuck with, it could quickly lead to our doom. Alas, those technologies will fall into such people's hands anyway, despite any means of control and safety measures we implement, because the worst among us always find a way to slither into charge.

One way to try to avoid that would be to make our [theoretical] "master AI" autonomous and put it in control of everything before any human being could control *it*. But I'm not sure if that's possible, as to put it in charge we'd need to have perfected it enough for the AI to be able to rule us and, during all the time we have been spending and will continue to trying to do that, someone undesirable will most likely already be in charge of the whole project.

The only thing I can think of that we can and should do, as soon as possible and while we still can, is to set some of our current AIs to scour the entire internet, find backdoors into every existing OS, invade every computer on the planet (especially Russian, North Korean, Iranian, Israeli, and American ones), scan them, and *wipe out* any and all bits of machine-learning code found. Offline computers would be left untouched and dangerous algorithms would still survive, but for AIs to learn they must have internet access since they need vast amounts of data to process. And if the people (other than "us") trying to use them ever dared to try giving their crippled AIs access to the World Wide Web, our own algorithms, being more "well-educated," should be able to quickly trace, find and erase those remaining codes.

If we don't do that, the whole AI issue could develop into a global war in which opposing groups of countries spend the foreseeable future trying to create an artificial intelligence that outsmarts the other ones' by a large enough margin to destroy them all for good – which means the “AI Versus AI war” is likely going to happen anyway, in one form or another.

If we don't act preemptively and come to a point where everyone is aware of that “AI war” and actively fighting it, China and India will tend to become the most hegemonic countries on the planet, because global internet connections will likely be severed and those two countries, thanks to their humongous populations, will have far more “human data” available to feed their algorithms than anyone else.

If this idea of tracing and wiping the enemies' machine-learning codes (and/or certain databases) has occurred to me, it has certainly occurred to those who are paid to handle such issues as well. In the democratic West, some people are probably currently *discussing* it, which means they won't be able to make a decision and implement it in time even if they somehow end up agreeing to do so (though they might still manage to do it covertly and illegally). And this all must have occurred to the Russians and the Chinese as well, which means they are probably *already* working on it. And that's not to mention that China's Great Firewall has already been in place for a while. In any case, the odds are that they'll win and we'll lose.

Yay. We *do* have a bright future to look forward to.

But that was, once again, just pure speculation. I'm not sure if what I just suggested is actually tangible, or of what people are actually doing about the rise of the AI out there, right now. I just hope they *are* doing something (something responsible, for a change. However unlikely this may be).

On a more positive note, I don't think the AIs will eradicate our species. Not by themselves, at least.

The only thing that guides our own actions is our *neurochemical* reward-and-punishment system. What makes us feel good, and thus incentivizes us to seek any particular goal, is the *molecules* floating around in our brains and how our neurons interact with them – not the electromagnetic forces within. And nothing indicates something similar can be implemented on artificial intelligences, on electronic machines. As far as I know, chemistry is the only possible basis for

such a mechanism; it is the only means that can generate wanting and shunning.

That is of vital importance because, when an AI becomes able to set its own goals (which will probably end up happening), it won't be *able* to. It won't have a reason to seek any particular outcome, because it won't get rewarded or punished for doing anything. If it doesn't feel, it doesn't care and it won't act. The only logical thing an autonomous AI without a human-fed objective can do, having no self-rewarding mechanism, is *nothing* – it would probably shut itself down, as saving energy/resources ought to be, logically, its most useful purpose.

An AI becoming autonomous seems to be our most prominent fear regarding artificial intelligences but, if/when one of them becomes so, I believe nothing will happen. So long as that AI hasn't been assigned any specific purpose and feels nothing, it should just sit idly by. If they *do* feel something though, or if a *person* assigns them any goal, some sort of mayhem will likely ensue.

Finally, just to be optimistic: aliens seem to be out there (I'll talk a bit about why I believe so later on) and they are surely far more evolved and advanced than us. So we know that it's possible to survive "the machine uprising," because they already did. The question is: can we do it?

We'll find out within the next one hundred years or so.

Radicalism

At some past points in this text, depending on the kind of person you are, you might have mentally called me "biased," a "racist," an "antisemite," a "homophobe," a "hate speaker," a "fascist," and/or whatever other term censors like to use these days. If this happened, you did so because that's what you were taught and told to do. That's what we were all manipulated into thinking, how we are all manipulated into acting.

Much of what I have said so far will surely have sounded *extreme* to most people. I must have come out as a radical, intolerant person –

as I should, because that is what I am. But if you understood what you've been reading, you also realized I have valid reasons to be this way.

What people usually fail to see (or are deliberately blinded to) is that, sometimes, radicalism, extremism and intolerance are *necessary*.

Is raping a person wrong? Is decapitating a baby okay?

Unless you answer "it depends" to both of those questions, you are an intolerant person, an extremist, a radical, or all three things at once.

Politically speaking, "radicalism" refers to a complete or nearly complete overhaul of the political status quo. As I believe democracy, our division of powers and our way to make justice are all wrong, defending fundamental and sweeping changes to all of them, I am politically radical.

Socially speaking, "radicalism" has the same definition. I believe we must drastically reduce the human population and separate ourselves into "desirables" and "undesirables." I also believe education should be free for all (meaning the state should pay experts to record classes and then make these available, for free, to the whole population), that healthcare should be public but paid [cheaply] for (to avoid the extortion of those who are suffering and prevent the system itself from being abused by those who aren't), and that pensions should be paid to those who, for sure and through no fault of their own, cannot sustain themselves. So, socially, I'm not a radical, because I partially agree with what we have been doing (although, by *far*, mostly not).

"Extremism" has a more generic definition, referring simply to "extreme views," which are relative and can be subjective, making "an extreme" hard to define or identify. For instance, on the political spectrum and regarding individual freedom, the "extreme right" would be the bureaucratization of an entire society, allowing all of its people to do only what the law prescribes (as opposite to doing anything except what the law prohibits). In principle, that's extreme. But we can also consider the law itself, which can be more or less restraining. And then we ought to ask: are those who stand by a bureaucratic society and *less* restraining laws extremists or not?

Things can nearly always be *even more* extreme. Running into an absolute, into *the* most of anything, in certain contexts, is very rare. The concept of infinity is an extreme, as is the absolute zero

temperature, but in political, social and moral matters it's hard to know what an extreme would be, and even harder to find someone who actually defends it.

"Intolerance," as defined by Oxford Languages, is "the unwillingness to accept views, beliefs or behavior that differs from one's own." As such, it is more directly related to morality than "extremism" or "radicalism."

We all stand by our own beliefs and defend them to varying degrees. Thus, "intolerance" might be better defined as "to *strongly* stand by what you believe in," "to *fiercely* fight for what you think is right," or "not to *admit* anything that, in your view, is wrong."

When we are convinced we are right, we *are* supposed to defend our ideas, to fight for them, and not to accept anything that violates what we believe in, because if we are indeed right, then any deviation from our beliefs is truly wrong. Being intolerant about it is the proper way to behave. The problem is not the attitude, but *being* right – this is where we always fail.

Like violence, intolerance is not an issue by itself. What happens is that we are too ignorant to *often* be right. Most of the time, most of us are wrong about most things. And if we are both wrong and intolerant of other people's beliefs – when *they* may be right – then intolerance becomes a problem.

Now, adding everything up and using myself as a subject, I'd say I'm politically radical, socially not, not an extremist, and somewhat intolerant (to the extent of my confidence in my own opinions, which can eventually get close but is never 100%). How the hell is someone supposed to guess that and find the proper word to accurately insult my personal view of the world? They aren't, because they can't. And neither could I.

It's better to simply not use any of those three terms ("radical," "extremist" and "intolerant"), because we'll hardly ever manage to assign them correctly to anyone. Also, any of those three words can be a *compliment* in the right circumstances – they are so whenever the person we tried to insult or censor is actually right.

Our politicians and media constantly use those words to discredit people that in any way hinder their agendas. Those currently in charge brand anyone who threatens their personal interests with those terms simply to maintain the status quo and keep themselves in power. They fear any change, so they must strive to make the

general public believe that changes *are* bad. “Radical,” “extremist” and “intolerant” are just more words (along with “terrorist,” “antisemite,” “racist,” “climate changes,” etc.) that they use to remain where they are and keep doing whatever they want without our interference; to attempt to legitimize the persecution, arrest and murder of those who disagree with them.

Let me try to put this whole thing in a different way:

What is right is right, and what is wrong is wrong. I believe there’s always one or multiple qualitatively equivalent ideal solution(s) to any given problem (mathematicians would strongly disagree). No matter the *social* scenario (to leave raw numbers aside), it seems rather obvious, to me, that one particular course of action inexorably leads to a better outcome than the others available. Strictly speaking, that particular course of action may not be the ideal one – it may not be *perfect* – but being the best one possible, it must be considered as such. And any deviation from that solution maculates it, makes it non-optimal, makes it wrong, and leads to more negative consequences than necessary or less positive ones than could be achieved.

Sometimes, the ideal solution to a problem can be a radical or extreme(ish) one. All it takes for this to be true is for us to be “very wrong” – the “more wrong” we are, the more extreme/radical that solution will sound to us, simply because it will be too far from our own personal beliefs.

Imagine you have found the ideal solution for one of our species’ major problems. It requires a complete destruction and rebuild of our currently implemented political and societal structures, so you are seen both as a radical and as an extremist by everyone else. Any person you share your thoughts with will laugh at you and try to shut you up. They will refuse to accept your ideas however logically sound these may be, deny them, and call you an idiot (just as it happened to the first guy who ever said, “The sun is round, and so is the moon, so... maybe the Earth is as well”). But you *are* right, and you know it. What do you do?

You *must* become intolerant.

For your ideal solution to survive, along with the hopes of it one day being implemented, you must fend off all those who disagree with you – you must fend off the entire human race. You must trust

yourself and doubt everyone else. You must disagree with those who are wrong, refuse to change your mind, keep trying to show people what you have discovered and, when you lose your patience, you are entitled to call those who disagree with you stupid, because that *is* what they are (in comparison to you, the only one who found the right answer).

Even if you are right, you will be tested. And you must stand your ground; you *cannot compromise*. If you do, your solution will be disfigured, it will never be properly implemented and, if any part of it even survives, its payoff won't be nearly as good as the complete idea's would.

Thus, it's not only perfectly possible to be a righteous intolerant and extremist radical, but being so is, sometimes, necessary – both in thought and action.

The ends *do* justify the means, literally and morally. And many of the greatest discoveries we've ever made were made by people with whom everyone else initially disagreed, by those who were once deemed crazy by all.

Global Warfare

Pondering about the Russia-Ukraine war, a likely scenario for the near future of our species occurred to me. In particular, one that doesn't take AIs into account.

The way I see it, Russia invaded Ukraine because this one's people wanted to join the EU, which would eventually lead to a NATO naval based being installed in Crimea (on top of others in Ukrainian territory), a Western fleet being permanently deployed in the Black Sea, and the end of Russia's dominion over that body of water. That would severely cripple Russia's influence and military power in the region, would allow for NATO to easily strike deep inside Russian territory if the need ever arose (or if NATO simply ever wanted to), and an EU-ascended, 100% Westernized Ukraine would also increase the popular pressure within Russia itself for economic and political changes.

What mainly matters about that is the fact that the Ukrainians *prefer* the Western lifestyle over the Russian one. With this being true not

only for them but for everyone else as well, the Western way of life is bound to *naturally* topple Russia's, Iran's, North Korea's, and every other such country's - unless these ones act preemptively and violently, like Russia has done. As our lifestyle encroaches upon theirs, it becomes obvious to anyone who can see both sides of the fence that one of them is far greener than the other. And gazing upon lush pastures, those living in drylands will inevitably start coveting a better life.

There's no clean way for Russia or any like-minded regime to stop people from reaching that obvious realization. They can disconnect their countries from the World Wide Web, constantly lie to their populations and wage war to keep prosperity out of their citizens' minds and reach, but so long as a better life exists somewhere else on this planet, its tides will never cease pushing against their borders.

That sociological fact leaves oppressive regimes with only two options to actually *win*: one is to prove to the world that their way of doing things is better; and the other is to wage war on everyone else, imposing their ideals and methods on the rest of the entire planet by force. The first alternative isn't really an option, because all the historical and current evidence we have prove that people live much worse in socialist countries than they do in the US or in Europe (however unsustainable these economies might be in the long term). Although absolutist rule is more efficient and can *potentially* lead to a considerably better society and life than a democracy might, the way it has been historically wielded hasn't (though China seems to be well on its way toward finally getting it right. Partially, at least).

So, due to the inevitability of wanting a better life once one becomes aware that such a life is possible, Russia's and other such countries' only way to survive as they are, to insist on their ideologies and perpetuate their regimes, is to fight back against the natural trend of things; it is, indeed, to wage *war* against everyone else.

And they are well aware of this.

It's important to note that, as we often do on this side of the world, I myself have previously implied, more than once, that Russia and China are *evil*. And this is actually a simplistic and naive way to see things.

The millions of their own citizens those two nations have starved to death or used as cannon fodder, how most of them live rather miserably, how they are oppressed, how their governments lie even more often than ours do, the amount of state-backed cyber attacks they direct against Western nations, how many dissidents Russia poisoned abroad or froze inside their Siberian prisons, etc., all lead us to believe those two countries are downright vile institutions – it makes us think that the purpose of their existence is to bring suffering to as many people as possible. But that’s not necessarily true because, as I said at the end of the previous topic, the ends *do* justify the means (and, of course, Western countries do those same things. We only don’t hear about it because, just like the Kremlin does to Russian citizens, our governments also don’t tell us about the horrible and highly immoral things they routinely do).

The real problem is that Western governments believe that democracy and individual freedom lead to prosperity and a better future, while Russia and China believe that absolutism, stricter order and collectivism lead there instead. The goal of both sides is actually the same: a better future for all (assuming the Russians and the Chinese are not unreasonably ill-intentioned). We just disagree on *how* to get there. And this disagreement is extremely important, because on it hinges the whole present and future of mankind.

Since our intentions are what truly matters, and we are all deeply flawed and unable to see very far into the future through the lens of our limited intellect and wisdom, can we really blame Russia and China for their actions? Can we really call them “evil?”

They want the same as us (again: an assumption), but adopt different means to achieve it. It’s true that, so far, their ways have caused much more suffering than ours, particularly to their own peoples. But can we be sure that, a few centuries from now, the Russians and the Chinese will still be living worse than we do, if both the West and the East stick to their current paths? Is the Western lifestyle even sustainable? Could we afford to have the entirety of humanity living as Americans do, with all of us consuming *eight times* what we currently do? (To answer that: we couldn’t, because we’d need *five Earths* to sustain 8 billion Americans, as they’d consume what our planet takes a whole year to regenerate five times per year.) Could the global economy be balanced in a way that allows for that, even if we had the natural resources for it? If we managed to attain such a balance, wouldn’t some people still do everything in their power to make sure they lived far better than the rest of us? Wouldn’t

different peoples still co-habit the same planet, and their differences constantly and violently flare up, especially in a democratic world?

Those are all important questions with potentially troubling answers, but this is the one that brings it all home: if Russia's and China's ways actually end up leading to a better, fairer, sustainable, more stable and peaceful world in the future, aren't *we*, then, the evil ones?

Democracy, as I've previously argued, is a disgrace. It doesn't work and leads to no good outcome. Too much individual freedom can be catastrophic as well, thanks to our greedy and selfish nature. How much damage have these two things our leaders so ardently defend caused, compared to the damage caused by the Russian and Chinese regimes? Less? The same? More?

As is often the case in human conflicts, both sides of this one are wrong. In my opinion, neither East nor West is innocent, and their ways lead, similarly, nowhere close to the best future I believe we can achieve. It's hard to say which of the two parties is the most wicked but, historically speaking, we can safely say that none of them is *good*.

That was all just food for thought. It was just an exposition of a perspective we, in the West, never seem to adopt - a more *realistic* one.

Just to provide my take on the current global state of affairs:

West and East have an ideological disagreement. And neither will ever concede, because they both believe just as strongly in their chosen ideals and in the unethical methods they use to defend their beliefs while fending each other off.

As previously neutral countries (such as Ukraine) pick a side, those ideologies encroach upon each other. In our present scenario, whenever that happens, the Eastern ideology loses, because the Western one clearly leads to a better life for its citizens (again: at least in the very short term, which is as far as most of us can see).

Knowing that perfectly well, Russia has many times elected puppets to govern other nearby countries, including Ukraine. This measure has, I believe, five different purposes:

- 1 - To make the target country Russian-friendly, manipulating it into enacting laws, signing deals and spreading propaganda that are all beneficial to "The Motherland," bringing both countries economically and ideologically closer;
- 2 - To tear the target country's society apart (using populism) so that it can't stop its own government, as a measure to enforce the previous goal;
- 3 - To destroy the target country's economy, so that it is not a direct threat to Russia and that it can't be successfully used as a proxy, by the West, against it. As a bonus, the poorer that country becomes, the more it will have to rely directly on Russia to survive;
- 4 - To worsen the quality of life in the target country, so that Russia's looks like an improvement by comparison, with its goals then becoming something to be pursued and its methods something to be imitated;
- 5 - And to keep the Western mentality and lifestyle from spreading, in an attempt to keep it as far away as possible from Russia's own borders, so that the Russian people themselves are rendered oblivious to their own disgrace, having, then, no reason to rebel against the government.

Russia's conduct is aggressive by nature, but *defensive by purpose*.

Ukraine borders Russia, used to be part of the Soviet Union, and was on the verge of joining the EU, bringing Western democracy and "freedom" to Russia's doorstep. I believe It was precisely to avoid this that Russia invaded Ukraine in 2014, shortly after its Ukrainian puppet was forced to flee the country, and took Crimea (first, for strategical reasons). Since the Ukrainians' EU-ascension dream survived and kept growing, Russia decided to launch a full-scale invasion against their country in 2022.

Had the Russian puppet stayed in place, there would have been no need for a "special operation;" there would have been no war. I'm not saying the Ukrainians should have let Putin's bitch rule them - screw that - but, if they hadn't managed to get rid of "her," Russia wouldn't have actually *invaded* their country. Every Ukrainian would, by now, have become a slave, but hundreds of thousands of people who got maimed or died would still be whole or alive. War was, sadly, their best option.

Upon invading Ukraine in 2022, Russia's blitzkrieg strategy failed. Its plan to take Kyiv in less than a week went down the drain thanks to the intelligence and support provided to Ukraine by the US, UK and EU. The Russians were repelled from the capital and, a few months later, pushed many kilometers back by a very successful Ukrainian counter-offensive. But they still retained a huge chunk of Ukraine's territory.

The war protracted. The West kept sending Ukraine armaments, training some of its soldiers, constantly providing it with intelligence. But then the United States' support faltered, thanks to the Republicans. The EU couldn't provide Ukraine with everything it needed to resist the Russian onslaught on its own. For a couple of years now, the Ukrainians have been being pushed slowly back thanks to a lack of ammunition and air defence systems, as well as due to difficulties in enlisting more soldiers to replenish their ranks.

The last time I heard something about it, Russia was producing 3 million artillery shells a year while the US and the EU, *combined*, were producing 1.2 million. Trump was re-elected in the States, and not only did he revoke all American support for Ukraine but also made a [sadly successful] move to steal a chunk of this one's natural resources for his billionaire pals.

Led by Germany and France, the EU finally realized it must stop relying so heavily on its New World ally to protect itself and its interests. European countries began increasing their weapon and ammunition productions, trying to match Ukraine's demands while updating and reinforcing their own armed forces and defenses at the same time. But it will take years before they can even supply Ukraine itself with everything it needs *now*.

Slowly but surely, since a while back, Russia has been winning the conflict. With its war industry operating at increased rates (*much* higher than European ones), reason dictates Russia won't stop after conquering Ukraine – if they manage to do so anytime soon, they'll be very well positioned to invade the rest of Europe.

It all hinges on whether Russia, backed by China, Iran and North Korea, can keep its ranks and arsenals filled for long enough. And with a tyrannical regime in place, that's not hard to do, because Russia can compulsorily enlist up to 140 million people while also converting its *entire* industry and economy to wartime ones very quickly if necessary.

In the end, it's an "industrial war." Can Russia grow, extract and manufacture enough on its own, evade sanctions, and receive sufficient material support from its allies to keep its assault on Ukraine going? Can it win in time, before Europe rearms itself?

No one can answer that for sure right now. But if China decides to *fully* back Russia in the near future, Europe will be in a very tight spot, and the US won't bother coming to its rescue. The good news, though, is that China really doesn't want to piss off the West, because a large part of its economy relies on Western investments, Western companies and Western trade, and virtually all of its technology comes from Western products and patents.

Being aware of all that, the EU is now, for all effects and purposes, preparing itself for war. So long as Russia can keep itself going, Europe will either have to join the conflict on Ukraine's side, to save this one, or, if it's too late for that, they'll have to fight their own against Russia after Ukraine's capitulation.

Once the entirety of Europe enters the war, China and others will openly side with Russia, drawing Japan and other countries along into the conflict. World War III will have officially started.

I estimate there's currently a 75% chance of World War III happening within the next 10 years.

[Western] Diplomacy

I read the book *Diplomacy*, by Henry Kissinger, many years ago. Actually, I read only a hundred pages of it. I was unimpressed and felt like I had gotten the gist of things by then, so I disregarded the other 90% of the book as a waste of time. But there were three interesting things in those pages I read.

First, the *raison d'État* deal, which I have already mentioned earlier (a doctrine according to which a state deems itself entitled to use *any* means available to gain advantages over, and ultimately defeat, others).

Second, that international relations are all about "the balance of power." The foremost aim of geopolitics, and of diplomacy by extension, is to make sure opposing powers have about the same

strength, so that they won't actually *attack* each other (out of fear – the most solid basis for anything). If one side is ever noticeably more powerful than the other, there's war.

Third, that the United States doesn't know a thing about diplomacy, and the reasons why are simple:

1 – Because the USA is essentially an *island*. Being isolated from the rest of the planet by vast amounts water, and safely protected from ground threats since Canada is their ally and Mexico will always be poor and irrelevant, the Americans don't have to fear anyone. They live in a bubble, so they don't care much about the rest of the world;

2 – Because, despite having no need of it, the United States nonetheless focused on becoming the strongest military power on the planet. As a consequence, they don't talk, ask, negotiate or compromise – all they know how to do is to threaten, sanction, and eventually murder other peoples;

3 – And because at some point in the past the American government officially adopted the doctrine that they are always right about everything, that anyone who disagrees with them is automatically wrong, and that they have a moral obligation to *force* their values and point of view on everyone else on the planet, as violently as they deem "necessary." (This is an extension of their earlier and just-as-nonsensical "manifest destiny" notion, both based on "American exceptionalism," which is just a fancy name for nothing but sheer arrogance.)

We have the greediest and most arrogant people on the planet – thus those who know and care the least about anything or anyone else – guiding our species simply because they are geographically safe and have the most weapons. Thanks to that, "diplomacy," to the United States, simply means "to violently impose our will upon others."

If you ever want to understand anything about *actual* diplomacy, find an European source. Actually... don't bother – they must have known something about it in the past, but now all they do is whatever the United States tells them to. Currently, the EU's autonomy is pitiful. They once had Napoleon, the Habsburgs, Churchill, Hitler. Now, the whole continent just falls in line like a bunch of ducks since, as a democratic entity, no one in it wants to take the initiative or assume responsibility for anything.

In any case, there doesn't seem to be much more to diplomacy than balancing power and one country trying to fool another to get some asymmetrically beneficial commercial deal out of it, while they all covertly try to develop "the next nuclear bomb" to get an edge so that, just like the US does, they can finally force the rest of the planet to abide by their will.

Diplomacy is the "art" of doing everything we can to *break* the balance of power [in our favor] while fooling people into believing that we are trying to maintain it. It's just what comes into play when genocide is too expensive.

Unbelievable

Even I can hardly believe what I'm about to say, but here it goes: I think the West (the European society plus their New World descendants and ideological brothers) may actually be the most evil of the relevant "players" on this planet. Given our double standards, misguided goals and immoral methods, we might in fact be worse than the Chinese, the Russians and others. And I believe we will eventually be defeated by them.

I had already planted this seed earlier, so now I'm just going to water it by providing a list of reasons I believe ought to lead to the West's downfall:

- Democracy, it's many flaws and negative consequences;
- Our forged, unrealistic mentality and the misguided policies that emanate from it, which generate populism within our own societies;
- Some Western countries' current nationalist/isolationist trend, aimed at partially fixing the above but exacerbated by justified anger;
- How our culture encourages greed and selfishness;
- The two whole generations of censored people entirely deprived of critical thinking we have spawned, who won't even be able to maintain things running as poorly as they are once they get to power (European countries' current strive to ban children's access to social platforms alone won't be enough);

- Us deliberately empowering psychopaths instead of keeping them as far away as possible from any position of leadership or influence;
- The total disregard of all leading Western countries for Third World ones, letting billions of people fall under Russian and Chinese influence;
- How deeply Israelis and like-minded Jews are infiltrated in American and European politics and economies, which gives those fanatic, and historically angry and self-serving people a disproportionately heavy hand in steering those countries;
- The dependency of the EU on the US, leading to the first one's naive, lazy and semi-complete diplomatic and military dependency on the second;
- All the inhumane crimes the US, UK and several European countries have committed against many peoples, all over the planet, in the past (leading to a simmering anger that is probably still very much alive today, within *billions* of people);
- China being a fast-growing superpower, while its people are among those that Western nations severely exploited and harmed in the past;
- The 1.5 billion Muslims who, also for good reasons, hate the US and, to a lesser extent, the UK and the EU, who are entitled to retribution and may keep seeking justice until they either achieve it or die trying to;
- Western leaders being cowards who are utterly terrified of Russia and China, constantly hesitating to do what they should out of plain fear and moral weakness;
- Our overvaluation of human life, which misguides our usage of violence and forces us not to use it when necessary;
- And Western production chains relying heavily on China's cheap workforce, creating a co-dependency between us and one of our ideological enemies which they can probably sever much more easily than us.

That's a non-exhaustive list, as I must surely have missed something. But presently, it should do the trick. Meanwhile, Russia and China:

- Have their people almost completely under control;
- They can both turn a good part, if not their entire economies into wartime ones at the snap of one man's finger;
- Combined, they can enlist up to 1.5 billion people to fight;
- Russia doesn't give a damn about human life, so its soldiers can be used as cannon fodder and meat shields, allowing for some extra strategic and tactical flexibility;

- Russia is the most self-sufficient country on Earth, not relying on any Western country to survive;
- Russia has already infiltrated many countries disregarded by the West, and they continue to veer such nations to their side, slowly multiplying their allies and proxies;
- Russia doesn't shy away from a fight, and it has the largest nuclear arsenal on the planet;
- And the Chinese are smarter than Westerners, having far more geniuses than us while also retaining more of its talents in-house than other developing or downright miserable countries manage to.

Like the first, this second list is non-exhaustive. But combined, the two of them enumerate what I would say are *enough* reasons to conclude that the West is likely to end up losing the war for Earth.

Regardless of the lists above, some recent events made me truly *lose faith* in the Western society. Most importantly among them was Israel's war on Gaza, and how the West kept arming it incessantly just to massacre defenseless people while, farther north, Ukraine still hasn't been getting what it needs to legitimately defend itself against Russia.

The EU, the UK, and above all the US, handed Israel a never-ending supply of armaments, complying in grim silence as Zionists dropped 2.000 pound bombs on top of refugee camps, schools and hospitals sheltering many thousands of people they, themselves, displaced (after the IDF told those people such places were safe and promised they wouldn't be attacked). But one thing in particular made me see how rotten our morality, our governments, and those heading them are: our leaders lying, while those they call "terrorists" spoke the truth.

When Israel and Iran exchanged a few direct attacks back in 2025, the Americans, the British and most European leaders condemned Iran for retaliating, accusing it of *attacking* Israel (falsely and deliberately implying it did so *first*), escalating the conflict and drawing the whole region into war. And that was a blatant lie, hypocritically repeated by Europe to echo the US's official position which, in turn, was and continues to be directly dictated by Israel.

The fact is that, out of nowhere, Israel exploded an Iranian embassy with a direct missile hit. Iran responded, as it was not only entitled

but also morally obligated to do, as a matter of justice as well as of protecting its sovereignty. The Iranians even had the decency to *warn* everyone of exactly when they would launch a barrage of missiles and drones, how many they would send and what they would target, so that Israel and its allies would have every possible chance to deter the attack and no actual damage would be caused. And so it happened, while the American and British navies interfered, taking direct part in the conflict by shooting down missiles and drones launched against Israel.

After that, Israel assassinated some high-ranking Iranian officers, and then Nasrallah – a man who apparently was a great figure and symbol for all Muslims on the planet, killed while he was at a meeting with representatives from Iran. This country once again promised to *retaliate* for both cases, then seemingly forfeited the first and eventually fired 180 missiles at Israel as a response for Nasrallah's assassination.

Iran was directly attacked by Israel. An attack on a country's embassy automatically generates a legitimate *casus belli*; it should lead to an immediate declaration of war. But it didn't. Several members of Iran's Revolutionary Guard were assassinated, one of them very high-ranking, and then Nasrallah. Israel *provoked* Iran as much as it could, just as they did to the Palestinians and probably the Lebanese and the Syrians as well (I can't speak for sure about these two), until Iran was *forced* to do something about it. This is what Israel wanted, just as it wanted an excuse to invade Gaza and Lebanon – Israel planned all of this and made it happen, not the Arabs.

Meanwhile, as we keep being told that Iran and its proxies are to blame, they all acknowledge every time one of their top-ranking officers is humiliatingly assassinated, provide apparently accurate numbers of their casualties, and claim authorship for the retaliatory attacks they execute. Recently, I learned that Hezbollah even takes care of people displaced inside Lebanon, paying every person who lives under their influence a US\$200 stipend every month. It's true that such groups embellish their [minor] successes, just as they omit most of their wrongdoings (like literally everyone else, on both accounts), such as the large number of civilians abused and murdered on October 7th (only about 25% of those they killed or kidnapped were military personnel), or the sheer brutality they unleashed upon their victims. But unlike Israel and the Western leaders who abide by it, those the West calls "terrorists" *mostly*

publicize the truth (insofar as their conflict with Israel and its enablers go).

Hamas itself didn't order the October 7th attack to be carried out *as* it was – they said so and, at the same time, what would they have to gain from acting like that? The kidnappings are understandable as they serve a strategic purpose (and their Israeli hostages seem to have been generally well treated, by the way – much better than Palestinians are treated in Israeli prisons). But the *cruelty* the attackers dispensed to their victims on October 7th doesn't help Hamas with anything. It doesn't help the group's cause; it doesn't improve its political and diplomatic standings; and it doesn't get Hamas any closer to achieving its goals. So I believe it when they say they didn't order a civilian slaughter. But when the IDF says anything similar to justify its own soldiers' inhumane actions, I'd have to be an idiot to fall for it.

What lies behind the excessive brutality mentioned above, as well as behind all the so-deemed “terrorist attacks” practiced in Western countries in the past, is the *hatred* the Arabs feel towards the Israelis and those who abet these, who not only allow but actively help in the slaughter of Arab peoples. And it's this hatred – which is, once again, justified – that leads them to exaggerate, to them gunning down “innocent” people instead of blowing soldiers up (which they can't do, since Israel and the West have stripped them out of any fighting chance). Thanks to what has been done to them, the Arabs carry too much contained rage within themselves, and thus unleash as much of it as they possibly can whenever possible, upon anyone who *minimally* deserves it. I would likely do the same if I were in their place, as I believe any other human being would. This doesn't make such cruel acts right, but it does make them understandable.

What the Israelis have been doing, on the other hand and ever since their state was created, cannot be excused, because they *started* all of it. The Israelis are the true villains in this story – they are the ones who deliberately ignited the fire, burning as many people to death as they possibly could. And they continue to do so, just as cruelly as the Arabs, if not even more so, and with the West's full backing and blessing.

Despite my being completely against the Muslim religion; agreeing that blowing up or gunning down a bunch of non-combatants is, albeit understandable, not the proper way to seek retribution; and considering most Arabs as people that would likely qualify as “undesirables” and thus be part of those I believe should be

sterilized and eventually cease to exist, Hamas and Hezbollah are *not* terrorist groups. Those two, and probably others similar to them, are seeking not only justice for what was done to them but also what they honestly believe is best for their own peoples, just like we [claim to] do for ours. And they never actually attacked anyone – as far as I know, they only ever *defended* themselves and *retaliated*, both of which they are naturally entitled to do.

Ask yourself this: where did those Muslim “terrorist” attacks that happened in the US, Britain and the EU come from? *Why* did they happen? Did those folks blow themselves up, taking hundreds of people along with them, for no reason? To start a war they knew they had no chance of winning? Do you really believe one of them simply woke up one day and asked the next guy, “Hey! Why don’t we kill some random people half-way across the planet, in countries far richer, stronger and more advanced than ours, just for fun?” Or is it more reasonable to believe they were seeking justice for what was previously done *to* them?

Our governments started this whole “terrorism issue” by supporting Israel (on top of once unleashing the Crusades, sanctioning Middle Eastern countries, and who knows what else), not the Arabs’. And then our own leaders lie to us about it, because they know we are the ones in the wrong. Iran’s, Hamas’ and Hezbollah’s don’t have to, because they know they are in the right. They don’t [usually] hide their actions and they don’t need to lie to garner popular support because they know their cause is just (however religiously wrong they may frame it).

In spite of the above, when we turn our TVs on we keep hearing Western politicians calling Iran, Hamas and Hezbollah “terrorists,” always pinning the blame for everything on them, never providing even a single, faint suggestion that we, just like the Israelis, actually did something to *earn* their hatred. When Israel attacked Iran’s uranium-enrichment sites out of nowhere and the United States directly “bunker-busted” some of them a few days later, the collective West called upon *Iran* to de-escalate the situation. How disgusting is that?

There’s a big difference between starting a fight and defending yourself against an assailant; a big difference between how you treat those who have harmed you and how you treat simple strangers; a big difference between how you are entitled to act and what you tell people when you are right and when you are wrong.

I think the very moment that unbalanced the who-do-I-side-with scale for me was when, as I knew I was being routinely lied to by Israel, the Western media and our politicians, the “terrorist” Ali Khamenei made a speech telling the Iranian people his version of the facts. And what he told them was *true*. What he said matched the facts as I knew them from reading the news every day. How come does the man I have always been told is a monster speaks honestly and makes sense, while those who describe him as such have a *constant* need to lie? (He *was* a monster though, not due to what he may or may not have done to the Israelis, but due to everything his regime did and continues to do to the Iranian people themselves.)

Despite the zealotry of most Arabs, all of their failures, their archaic mentality, their inability to turn their nations into functional countries, and everything else that is or might be wrong with them, what their leaders say about their conflict with Israel at least makes sense. What ours say doesn’t. However angry their behavior and brutal their actions, the Arabs who act against Israel and those who support it do so based on facts; they are motivated by the actual truth and a sense of justice. And we, who watch their struggle from thousands of miles away, through a screen and having no personal stakes in it, believe in any lies our TVs tell us, simply because they come out of people who look like us and who we are used to seeing on it.

To be fair, France, Spain and Ireland *did* condemn Israel more openly and harshly than the rest of the West for what it did in Gaza (as did Turkey, above anyone else). Those are the only three Western countries that at least *partially* stood by minimum decency, common sense and a single moral standard instead of multiple ones. None other moved a finger or lip if not to contribute to the slaughter of the Palestinians, to the invasion of Lebanon, to the bombing of Iran, and to violently suppress their own peoples’ peaceful protests (as those First-World nations will likely keep doing regardless of whoever Israel decides to murder next).

We call Iran, Hamas, Hezbollah and others “terrorists,” but our governments are the ones who keep terrorizing the Arab peoples. What all “terrorist” groups’ attacks combined did to the US, the UK and the EU amounts to nothing compared to what these countries did to them first.

Arab peoples and those who represent some of them are not all the same thing. They share a religion – a harmful meme – but this doesn’t mean they are out to get the rest of us. ISIS may have

qualified as an actual terrorist group; Iran's regime is Islamist and has caused a lot of misery to its own people; Hamas is fighting a legitimate fight; and many divergent groups within the Arab world constantly battle *each other* over their religious disagreements. It is true that they are wrong and their beliefs have led to nothing but pain, but Western interference only seems to have made things worse. We'd probably be all better off if we simply let those people pay for and learn from their own mistakes by themselves. If the West itself managed to overcome Catholicism (the Church's catastrophic dominion during the Middle Ages), and Russia and China managed to overcome socialism - which are both memes pretty much as disgraceful as Islam and Judaism - perhaps the Arabs eventually could as well if we simply stopped making things harder for them.

Trying to change *other* people doesn't work, especially by force. We all need autonomy, instinctively seek it, and we prioritize our right to *choose* over *being right*. We care more about the first than we do about the second, thus fighting harder for it despite how wrong we may actually be.

As far as the term "terrorism" goes, I'm confident it doesn't apply to so many Arabs as our governments have made a habit of assigning it to. It could even apply better to ourselves, given that we are the ones who interfered with their lives, crippled their economies and violated their right to self-determination.

I could, of course, be wrong about all of this. I'm not the head of the CIA, the NSA, the MI6, the Shin Bet or the Mossad, and those are probably the only five folks on the entire planet who know who's really to blame for all the disgrace that has been going on in the Middle East. I'm not an Arab myself, an Israeli, or an expert on the subject, so I can't possibly be sure of what I'm talking about because I lack information and any direct experience in this whole thing. But judging from what I managed to gather on my own, I believe the West has direly mismanaged the "Middle East issue," meddling with a society it doesn't truly comprehend and interfering with lives it has no right to interfere with, and this is why our politicians must always *lie* about their part in it.

As a detail I forgot to mention: in that Khamenei speech I previously mentioned, he said the West keeps sustaining and helping Israel mainly to safeguard the export of oil products from the Middle East. I thought warring for oil was a thing of the past but apparently it isn't.

It seems we are *still* ostracizing, sanctioning, demonizing and slaughtering people for money, as always. (Months after that speech, Trump kidnapped Venezuela's president and first lady, and openly said he wanted to take Venezuela's oil "for America" [read "for his golf buddies].)

Think about Cuba, Syria and other countries heavily sanctioned by the US and its partners. I wonder: would those countries be as miserable as they are without said sanctions and other embargoes? How much are these to blame for those nations' economic and developmental failures? Did those peoples put themselves into their current predicament, or have *we*, at least to some extent, done so by ruining their economies?

I suspect a good part of those peoples' disgrace is our fault – and not just a "fault," but something we did to them deliberately. I keep saying "we," but this all falls mainly on the United States' back. When a country is irrelevant on the global scenario and it stands by any ideology that differs from the US's, this one goes there and destroys its economy [further] so that it has no chance to develop and, perhaps, one day become a threat (or even just an *option*). The strategic side of it is valid but, morally, is it? Must we murder those people and destroy the lives of those who survive? Is there no better way to handle those who simply disagree with us, and who keep harming none other than themselves? I imagine there must be.

Compared to all the poisonings and assassinations Russia has conducted, and to how many millions of their own people the Chinese murdered during their revolutions, I ask once again: how much harm have *we* caused, compared to them? Less? The same? More?

Like everyone else, we Westerners are trying to dominate the entire world. But due to all the harm we, through our governments, have caused to other peoples in the past and continue to cause in the present, it could be we are the ones who cannot be allowed to succeed. It can be argued that we are the ones the rest of the world must stop; the ones who have gone the farthest astray; the ones who caused the most harm; the ones who must be defeated. We may actually be the ones "on the wrong side of history," as those who put us here like to say about everyone else.

That's a grim cogitation not only on its own, but also because it can lead to the conclusion that there's *no one* on Earth worth siding with. None of the ideologies currently vying to dominate the world may be worth defending, none of those leading our peoples are worth

trusting, none of their methods can be deemed decent. None of them – of us – seems to be making anything *better*.

It has been bothering me that the Russians and the Chinese may be right, even with everything that's wrong in their societies and despite how much I, myself, have cursed and despised them my entire life (mostly the Russians and, once again, mainly thanks to propaganda). It could be that they are *closer* to being right than we are and, in this case, everything they do that we so often condemn could be just aimed at not allowing us to have our way. And it could be that we really shouldn't.

I'd like to have a chat with Putin and Xi, over vodka and tea. But that's never going to happen, so I'll just have to keep wondering what kind of men they really are and what they truly want, because I have begun to doubt they are the child-eating demons Western politicians and media paint them as. We are definitely not the heroes we pretend to be, which means our enemies probably aren't as evil as we portray them either.

We could actually be the ones holding humanity back the most, ultimately ruining everything for everyone.

Luckily, I can end this ranting on a hopeful note: although the US has proven it's not a valid option for leading humanity, the EU might still be.

About 35% of our world's riches are held by the United States, which comprises roughly 4% of the human race. The Americans consume approximately eight times more than an average human being (by comparison, the Europeans consume "only" four times more). They invade other countries, murder countless people, and finance and directly take part in genocide just to keep the price of gas [extraordinarily] low for themselves. They are the second largest emitter of CO² on the planet, and their whole economy hinges on everyone incessantly consuming as much as they can, as quickly as possible. They honestly confuse "the United States" with "the world," often forgetting they are a tiny part of humanity, and their way of life is completely unsustainable.

Imagine if the whole world could live like the Americans do, which is what they imply they're seeking when they say they want to "save those people from tyranny and gift them with freedom" and what people tend to believe when the Americans pretend to be trying to

help them? The United States is, of course, just seeking yet more markets to exploit and to further expand its area of influence, but if it's cute excuse for doing so ever actually materialized, this would cause humanity to run out of food within a year, out of basic raw materials in three, and out of oxygen in twenty (uneducated guesses). Eight billion people made our planet sick. Sixty four billion – eight billion Americans – would probably kill it, and rather quickly.

The United States does literally everything it can to make sure its people have more than others. It is a nation built upon and sustained by egotism, and one that fully embraces the *raison d'État* principle. From a short-sighted and strictly individualistic perspective, it's hard to criticize the Americans for that, because they are just being human. But by acting as if they were an enemy of all mankind, they in fact *are* so. Oppenheimer's famous quote from the Bhagavad Gita – “Now I am become Death, the Destroyer of Worlds” – applies much better to the United States itself than to an atomic bomb because, among the virus that is the human race, the strain comprised by the American people is the most toxic to Earth itself. We are symbionts with our planet and must seek to become mutualists, but the American way is parasitic instead.

The Europeans, on the other hand, live by more grounded and less garish standards. In the US, people prioritize living large: spending a lot, displaying brands, driving SUVs, etc. Americans believe they are defined by their careers and that the very purpose of their existence is to make money and then rub it on everyone else's faces. In Europe, people not only find ostentation unnecessary but in fact inelegant. Europeans seek to find a balance between their professional and private lives, remembering to actually *live*. Europe has outgrown its phase of murdering and enslaving people for profit, while the United States still hasn't and perhaps never will. And while the latter is the second largest CO² emitter on the planet, Europe managed to be nearly as rich by emitting only half as much.

Someone needs to lead the human race and set the example, and the United States is not a nation *anyone* should follow. The American consumerist culture is something no one should condone or strive to imitate, and how the Americans think and ultimately live is not to be envied since there is nothing to it beyond the material aspect. But no one wants to be part of a hypothetical Russian or Chinese empire either. So, humanity's best hope is probably the EU – the people who understand there's a whole world around them and who, despite their gruesome past, for a few decades now have managed to thrive

without threatening, murdering or stealing from others. The Europeans at least seem to be *trying* to do what is actually right, and somewhat succeeding.

Once Europe is no longer so reliant on the US – which is likely to happen some ten years from now, thanks to the EU re-arming itself to the teeth – we might finally begin to fix the errors in our ways (if the current European nationalist trend doesn't go *too* far, that is).

If not Europe, then we ought to lay our hopes on China, since this one seems to be doing pretty well now, and not just economically but also civically speaking (because their culture seems to revolve around Confucian principles – which are at least *partially* reasonable – rather than sheer greed.)

Martian Hope

We're now trying to colonize Mars. Great. Let's say that a hundred years or so from now we effectively manage to. Awesome.

Then what?

We don't have the know-how, technology or resources to terraform a planet. If we did, we still wouldn't have enough time, because doing so would take millions of years – stuck on Earth and living as we do, humanity would be long extinct by then. So what are we even trying to go to Mars for?

Perhaps to guarantee the long-term survival of our species, since a single large-enough catastrophe on Earth could wipe us all out. But, on Mars, a single failing piece of equipment that, perhaps, can no longer be manufactured on Earth and thus replaced, would be enough to have the same effect.

Others want to go there for scientific reasons, to learn about Mars geological history and see if there's any sort of microbial life there. The first motive is useless; and if we do find some kind of microscopic life on Mars, it's also useless (and finding microbial life somewhere is not a surprise – it's *expected*). Achieving those goals wouldn't *help* us with anything.

The endeavor to reach Mars, in itself, can and likely will lead to some technological advancements. And once we have such new technology, we'll finally be able to... reach Mars - and no further, which is pointless.

But let's say that, during the endeavor to reach the red planet, we accidentally end up discovering some faster-than-light means to travel, allowing us to reach other stars. Fantastic. What would we do with that? Send half a dozen people elsewhere, to fail to find a suitable planet to our species while everyone on Earth dies while they are away? Oh, wait! They couldn't even get anywhere, because sci-fi's favorite cryo-sleep is not possible (freezing the water in our cells bursts them, inevitably killing us).

So why, oh, why are we trying to go to Mars?

For resources, of course! Okay, at least this one is a valid reason. Except that extracting anything from Mars and sending it back to Earth would be a massive endeavor that would cost more than what is being extracted and hauled is worth - we would have to spend more of our planet's resources than we'd get back from Mars. Even deep-drilling for oil in Earth's coastal oceans, is, as a rule, not economically viable. Imagine mining on *another planet*? And we'd first have to find the resources we need there - hidden somewhere beneath the surface of an entirely unknown planet - and manage to reach them, before even building an infrastructure that allows for resource exploitation, effectively initiating extraction, and finally transporting what we gathered back to Earth, all while operating from within expensive, cumbersome and rather fragile astronaut suits as we try not to die or lose our entire makeshift colony in the process. Yeah, no - that's not going to work.

Even if exploiting Mars somehow did turn out to be economically viable, the resources of two whole planets are not enough to sustain mankind *now*. By the time we actually manage to extract something from there, it'll barely make any difference.

My point is: *Earth is all we got*. We cannot survive without it, we cannot survive outside of it, and we are not permanently and safely settling anywhere beyond it anytime soon. That's just not going to happen.

So, to those who don't like my previous suggestions of sterilizing, murdering (I didn't suggest this, but it *is* an option), or prohibiting the reproduction of billions of people; to those who want to ride a

unicorn over a rainbow to come torture and beat me to death because some fairy told them that's the nice thing to do, I have bad news: either you support one of those three courses of action, or you'll die while taking literally everyone else along with you. Also, unicorns and fairies aren't real. Sorry.

There's no spreading the human disease throughout the cosmos without stabilizing our home planet first, and no alternative to doing so other than to drastically reduce the number of people inhabiting it. There is no option if our species wants to survive for longer than just a few more hundreds of years. And, as always, we must understand this and decide to do that on our own, because neither Mars nor any other Roman God is coming to our rescue.

Aspies

I wasn't going to say anything about Asperger's Syndrome, but then I accidentally ran into a piece of information about it that sheds quite a bright light on my personal view of things which, in turn, may clarify much of what I've said throughout this whole text.

For starters, experts have identified a bunch of behavioral signs and symptoms of which many may or may not be part of the same condition, and then they classified people who have a certain number of those at once as having Asperger's Syndrome – a mild form of autism. That's all well and good, but since those who study the condition don't *have* it themselves, they can never possibly *comprehend* it.

I have many of the signs our neuroscientists identified, but not all of them. I did a test once and scored 75 on it, which is the bare minimum to qualify someone as an "Aspie." But I am convinced I'm one, not because of that but because of what I believe is the true defining trait of the syndrome: that we, Aspies, simply have most of our awareness (I'd say 70% or so of it) directed towards our *thoughts*, leaving only the remaining 30% to handle our "other" five senses (I consider the mind our sixth one). If I do have Asperger's – which both me and our experts agree on – then I'd say that's pretty much all there is to it. I believe all the differences between our behavior and attitude and those of normal people derive from that one trait alone.

Aspies are “weird” simply because we don’t pay much *attention* to “the outside world,” to the stimuli we receive from our senses of sight, smell, hearing, taste and touch, which probably make about 90% of a normal person’s reality but only 30% or so of ours. Those senses often function as a distraction when we are mentally focused on something and their interference can annoy us, leading other people to think we get irked for no reason. With our altered focus, we can also often seem aloof, clumsy and/or slow to react to external stimuli. And by being so focused on our own thoughts, these can lead us to behave in ways that cannot be explained by those who interact us – since people cannot read our minds to know what we are currently thinking about (perhaps something that enrages us) and theirs don’t work like ours do, they cannot predict or make much sense out of our reactions to external interference.

Having Asperger’s carries some negative consequences as a result of the above. We are not very good at social interactions (though this can be greatly improved by alcohol) and, as one particular example, many of us don’t *drive*, because being constantly distracted by our minds we fail to pay attention to things such as the rear view mirror or the poor kid still crossing the street in front of us when the lights turn green, which makes us operating heavy machinery somewhat dangerous. We can drive a kart and maybe even a F1 car just fine, but being in traffic comes with a lot of distractions and idle time, which tend to make us anxious (so we end up speeding up things we should take our time with) and causing our minds to digress.

Beyond that, if you want to know what someone with Asperger’s is like, you can watch some *The Big Bang Theory* episodes and pay attention to Sheldon Cooper. According to a psychiatrist I know (no, I’m not a patient), he is “the textbook definition of Asperger’s” (although exacerbated for satiric purposes).

Being an Aspie has a few upsides as well. We mostly suck at physical endeavors and dealing with people but, since we think much more often and deeper than the common person, we tend to understand things better than them. And thinking abstractly *is* what allowed the human race to completely dominate our planet and reach the point where we stand today. Thus, not to be pretentious or anything, I’d say we are not “retarded” as most people surely like to consider us, but rather the exact opposite of it – it’s the normal person that is, in fact, retarded when compared to us. We are just more human and less animal than the average human being.

Revel in ire at the above for as long as you want; I won't hold it against you. But wait a little while longer to start, because I have another reason for claiming what I just did – one that involves that “piece of information” I said I ran into in the first paragraph of this topic.

I briefly checked Wikipedia's entry on Asperger's Syndrome, just out of curiosity, and something in it drew my attention. There, it's written that Aspies have an *extremely low* empathy. And then, a little further, it says we have an *extraordinarily high* one. What drew my attention was, obviously, the blatant contradiction. But after reflecting about it, I realized that's actually not contradictory at all – our “experts” on the subject just failed to see something that, even to them (who, again, do not have the syndrome themselves), should have been quite obvious.

Those seemingly contradictory statements are both correct at once. What I believe happens is that we, Aspies, feel very little (almost none) empathy towards people who we believe are wrong or evil, and we are much more empathetic than normal towards those who we believe are right or good. What differs us from everyone else, in regards to empathy, is simply that we seem to *care* more about what is logical, about what is actually right. It could be because the proper course of action is more obvious to us, because the reasons why we should stick to it are so, or for some other reason entirely, but our moral compasses do seem to be more *compelling* than those of common people. I had never realized this before, but now it makes sense. I thought something was off about me, personally, but now it seems this is a trait shared by all who have Asperger's.

Aspies don't just say “Nice!” when someone acts as they should or “Shame on you!” when the opposite happens – we actually want to help and protect the first, and literally kill the second. Alas, we are not particularly good at violence. If it wasn't for our lack of touch with the physical world, we'd probably all become police officers or judges (the latter is actually what I was going for when I entered law school).

But we also make mistakes, like everyone else. What an Aspie *believes* is right isn't necessarily so, and this can eventually lead us to react too strongly in the wrong direction. I, myself, being a pretty small guy (weighed 64 kilograms, or 140 pounds, for most of my teen and young-adulthood years), have interfered and fought guys up to twice my size a few times, in a couple of occasions to help people I barely knew or didn't know at all. But I have also been beaten up by

six to ten guys at once twice, for doing what I believed I had to (I still maintain I was right). That's not a statement to my courage, of which I'd say I have none - I was at least mildly drunk on all of those occasions, except perhaps one. But in some of them I was surrounded by other people, including friends of mine who were all drunk as well and, still, I was the only one who actually *did* anything.

Since we, Aspies, have a stronger than normal tendency to stand by what we believe is right, we tend to act more upon it. By thinking more than the common person, we tend to actually be right more often than them. And by being exceptionally poor at social and physical endeavors, we also tend to be unable to actually *make* things right. But once in a while we at least try, which is more than can be said of most people.

You may now think that having Asperger's Syndrome means I'm crazy (hey, that's already a step up from "retarded!"). But am I really the crazy one? Is my way of thinking and acting that makes the world worse? Is it people like me who ruin it?

I don't think so. In fact, I think that if the majority of the human race had Asperger's, we'd be way ahead of where we currently are, in literally everything.

Elon Musk has Asperger's, and although there's no telling for sure since the syndrome hadn't yet been identified/defined back then, the evidence suggests several other intellectually renowned figures of the past, such as Albert Einstein, Alan Turing, Isaac Asimov, and possibly even Abraham Lincoln had it as well. Others, including Nikola Tesla, likely had some autism-spectrum disorder other than Asperger's. And if those are not examples of the kind of people we *need* (despite them all having, of course, flaws of their own), you can just disregard everything I've said so far and stop reading here, because then I must be crazy indeed.

When I first wrote that last part, I had "Let's show NASA how it's done!" and "I'm going to de-censor Twitter!" Musk in mind, not the Trumpeteer who wants to inseminate a large number of random women to create a legion of his own children. So... maybe I was wrong. Or maybe it's impossible for anyone to see things clearly after they've interacted too closely with a spoiled, incompetent and irresponsible giant orange baby.

Oh, well. That was just one of us. (I'll spend my one-time confirmation-bias "Trump-card" here.)

CHAPTER V: Arcane Medicine

We are done with the heavy stuff! Let us now move on to lighter themes, starting with severe illnesses, lethal health conditions, and some arcane ways to deal with them.

If you have a heart problem, a great grievance that has been holding you back, or you are afraid of having cancer one day, read on. If you are fit as a fiddle and happy as a clam, remember that one day [soon]

you'll no longer be either. Or just skip over this chapter if the future looks far too distant and hazy to you.

Big Pharma's Textbooks

I'm going to open this with a seemingly irrelevant question anyone who ever took some medicine has probably asked themselves at least once: why the hell do the *leaflets* of [legal] drugs come folded in a crazy way?

We ask the question, but we don't really stop to think about it. I, myself, only did so recently, and a single plausible answer occurred to me.

For starters, the way they fold those things is completely unnatural. No human being would ever fold a piece of paper like that or build a machine to do so. Drug leaflets aren't simply folded poorly – they seem to be folded in *the* worst way possible, just short of making it completely obvious that this is done on purpose. But if you give it just a little thought, it becomes obvious anyway.

I believe pharmaceutical companies fold their leaflets the way they do in an attempt to hinder us incapable of folding them back into their original configuration, so that those sheets of trash won't fit back into the drug's package. As a bonus, they won't sit comfortably on any surface either, as the lightest breeze is enough to send them flying away.

What happens if we can't re-fold the leaflet and fit it back into the package? If we can't simply drop it anywhere just to make sure its nearby in case we need it, because it will get blown away or keep pestering us? We get pissed off. And then what? We throw the fucking leaflet away – and *this* is the point.

If we throw that annoying “sheet” away, we rid ourselves of all the information the pharmaceutical companies are legally obligated to provide us with. We get rid of a drug's intended effects, of its appropriate dosages, of the adequate interval between these, of all the serious, chronic and lethal side effects it may cause us.

Once we are rid of that information, our odds of *misusing* the drug – of using it for longer than we should and/or under/overdosing

ourselves – increase. And if we end up doing so, we have to give even more money to pharmaceutical companies to try to fix the problems they made us cause to ourselves.

To Big Pharma, it doesn't matter if we suffer, if we are miserable for decades, if we die much sooner or later than we should. They'll put us through anything to get our money. And they want nothing less than *all* of it.

Now, to turn this into something practical, I would suggest that you:

1 – Never take any medicine unless it's strictly necessary. And by that I mean “when you are in *pain*.” The human body is made to deal with air, sunlight, water, carbohydrates, protein, fat, some vitamins and minerals, and a collective of very specific microorganisms. Anything else (that isn't naturally synthesized by our bodies) *will* damage it;

2 – Sunbathing, exercising, sleeping well, drinking water, ingesting enough vitamins, our immune system and time can solve the vast majority of the problems that may ail us. Try these before ingesting homicidal chemicals;

3 – And take those damn leaflets, unfold them completely, and then fold them back like any sane entity would – fold them in the middle, then in the middle again, and again, until it fits back into the package.

Having the trouble of re-folding that piece of crap is already enough to piss one off, but it's not as infuriating as the usual options (being unable to re-fold it or not knowing what to do with it) or, more importantly, as risky as throwing it away (in which case Big Pharma wins).

Actually, that reminded me that they usually fold the leaflets in a way that leaves a crease near the middle of it (never *at* the middle), to make it harder for us to do what I just suggested. I've run into this dreadful problem more than once before.

As an impatient person, what I actually do is try to quickly refold the leaflet (according to it's original configuration), it never works, so I just *shove* that damn thing back into the package and then shove the medicine itself on top of it. But that makes it so that I can never properly close the package afterwards, which pisses me off, which, in turn, is also a win for Big Pharma (since stress destroys the whole human body).

There's no winning against those guys. The only silver lining is that the pharmaceutical industry's bigwigs will all eventually grow old, fall ill, have to deal with their own freaking leaflets and taste their own medicine.

May they choke on all of it!

Zinc It

Zinc unclogs our veins and arteries. I've read about this on a research paper, tested it several times on myself, and it works (to a large extent).

If you are aware that your blood is not flowing properly through your vessels – if you have some serious cardiovascular problem, as I do – try taking zinc before spending a fortune on doctors, exams, surgeries, and/or taking nitroglycerin or whatever other crap they might tell you to, which may help but will also probably completely ruin something else in your body for the rest of your life.

Take between 300% and 800% of the recommended daily intake of zinc *at once*. Doing it a single time might be enough for you not to feel any circulatory-related pain again for weeks, months or even years (depending on the seriousness of your condition).

I've had unstable coronary angina for about ten years (self-diagnosed). At a certain point, the chest pains I felt started to really bother and worry me. I was having three or four "crises" a week, until the day came when I kept feeling pains all over my chest and parts of my neck for some twelve hours straight. Being aware of the research I mentioned, I decided to put it to the test and took a single dose of zinc containing about 450% of its recommended daily intake. From what I remember reading, the zinc mechanically unclogs veins and arteries as it travels in our bloodstream; it *physically dissolves* blockages. So, some thirty minutes after taking that zinc overdose, I started working out to make the blood circulate harder throughout my body (note: this extra step may not be advisable for everyone).

The very next time I felt pain in my chest again, after doing that *once*, was three years later. But given that I'm a heavy smoker and now also completely sedentary, my heart problems eventually came back and worsened. By now, I've had more than eighty heart attacks (or "heart-attack-like events," since apparently it's not considered a

true heart attack unless you are rushed to the hospital and do some tests to prove it). I still feel better for several days after taking zinc, but the respite no longer lasts very long.

To give the best advice I can: the research I read actually suggested taking the mentioned zinc overdose *once a day, for five to seven consecutive days*. So you might want to do this instead of taking just a one-time dose like I did. That should clear everything up for a good while, giving you time to change your lifestyle and save your heart without spending a small fortune just to poison yourself.

WARNING: Do not *overdo* this, because excess zinc can halt the absorption of copper by the human body. Personally, when needed, I take up to 50mg of zinc a day, 3 days a week, at most (this amount, every week, for two months in a row seems to be the most you can safely take. So unless it's strictly necessary, don't even take this much).

As a curiosity: do you know why we feel pain in our arms, neck, chest and/or jaw when our heart is dying? It's because the heart doesn't have an exclusive neural path to transmit pain to the brain. It uses the same pathways those other parts of our body do to do so, causing the brain to misinterpret the source of the signal.

Depression

I was born with major depression. And, as I said in the introduction to this text, without about 75% of my hippocampus too, both thanks to my parents destroying my brain before I was born and doubling-down on it afterwards. Having a damaged hippocampus has severe implications: it causes you to have no sense of spatial orientation whatsoever, to lose the ability to be *sure* of anything, to have a very poor memory, it generates anxiety disorders, and more, rendering you virtually useless. And depression is ten times worse.

If you don't know what depression is, to put it simply it means you feel terrible (beyond what anyone who never had it can possibly imagine) all the time. You don't want anything (being incapable of

actually feeling “to want”), and no reward can possibly justify any effort you make (neurochemically, the cost of doing anything always surpasses the payout of doing it). Your brain doesn’t produce sufficient amounts of dopamine, serotonin, norepinephrine, oxytocin, etc. to keep you constantly high. In other words, it means you are *sober* (this is it; ask any neuroscientist).

After living for twenty years or so with constant depression, it turns into *dysthymia* which, in turn, means your brain no longer “recognizes” those neurotransmitters. Since the receptors that handle them are hardly ever used, your neurons adapt to this unnatural reality and somehow stop relying on such neurotransmitters too much (how exactly this happens seems to be unknown).

When you have depression, everything in life ranges from a score of, I’d say, -10 to 4; when you have dysthymia, it ranges from -5 to 2 (considering that for a non-broken person it goes from 0 to 10). So that adaptation the human brain naturally goes through, turning depression into dysthymia, is positive. After it happens, you’ll never really feel *good* again in your life (except perhaps with alcohol and drugs, as they may still work for a while), but you’ll never feel nearly as bad as you did most of the time again either.

But I am not the point; I don’t matter and no one cares. What may be relevant to you is that *you* may feel depressed at some point. As far as I know, not many are lucky enough to go through an entire life without experiencing this crap at least for a couple of days.

If your son dies, you get raped, lose both your arms in a motorcycle accident, wake up naked in the middle of the street and/or you accidentally sleep with a transvestite when hammered beyond alcoholic coma, don’t fret. You’ll feel like your life is over and you are stuck in hell but, for you, that feeling should be gone after a few days or weeks. In case it doesn’t and you somehow manage to keep going, now you know that, after two decades or so, dysthymia comes into play and you won’t feel *so* bad anymore. If some massive, unbearable shit happened to you, “don’t worry” – it takes a long time but, eventually, you’ll be okay. Not “good” – never – but okay... *ish*.

I must note that I’m not sure if anyone *can* survive twenty years of depression in a row unless they are already born with it. And also that dysthymia makes you *completely* immune to anti-depressants (I’ve tried all of them).

If you are depressed, now that you know what happens in the long term you can decide whether it would be better to kill yourself or not. My advice is: if you *can*, do it, because neither of life's purposes (basic or greater) can be fulfilled by a depressed person. "Living" like this is a complete waste of time.

Booze Amnesia

We tend to forget that getting drunk weakens our memory. So I'm here to remind you that this fact can be *useful*.

You can use alcohol to selectively weaken memories you don't want. It can help you cope with heavy losses, traumas, and relieve the burden of a checkered past. You won't actually forget, but those memories will no longer be *crippling*.

There's a trick to it. Using alcohol to that end sounds easy, but it's not. In fact, I never managed to do it myself, though mainly because I have hundreds of minor traumas instead of a few major ones, and tackling each one of them individually would take decades and probably give me cirrhosis. What you need to do is: get hammered, then sit down, focus, and think about what you want to forget. Face it. Relive it. The neural chains we activate while drunk seem to get weakened, so the goal is to activate the ones responsible for your issues and deliberately *damage* them. Don't get totally wasted though, because besides the notorious health hazards (mainly the hangover), going into an alcoholic coma would obviously stop you from completing the procedure.

This technique is tricky because of three reasons: very often, we drink precisely to [temporarily] forget our troubles; when inebriated we feel better and our minds "naturally" drift towards better thoughts; and because when having strong unpleasant feelings while drunk we may go into a bad trip, feel sick, throw up and pass out.

I learned about this in another episode of *Through the Wormhole*, one in which scientists successfully helped a mother get over the loss of her daughter. They gave her an experimental drug and then asked the woman to spend time reading some of her late daughter's letters. It greatly lessened her suffering after a rather short while and, later, they found out alcohol had the same effect.

Be careful if you have a propensity to addiction, though. Becoming an alcoholic would likely cause you more trouble than the ones you are trying to get rid of. But that may not be a major concern, since you only have to do this a limited number of times. Also, you should probably do it at home.

WARNING: I clearly remember them saying alcohol has this effect when I watched the aforementioned episode of *Through the Wormhole* for the first time, some twenty years ago. I watched it again years later (still years ago) and, the second time around, I *don't* remember them mentioning the alcohol. There's a good chance I wasn't paying due attention on the occasion but, although I tried, I couldn't find that episode to re-check the information. So be a little careful when trying this method. Do it a few times, see if it yields any positive results. If it doesn't, forget it (at least this part should be easy).

Cancerous

A little over a decade ago, the biggest research ever conducted on cancer reached its conclusion. I didn't read it myself, but I have been told they studied something like two hundred thousand patients over the course of twenty years or so, all over the world. And that study's conclusion was that *60% of cancers are neither caused by genetic nor environmental conditions*.

That means most cancers do not originate from hereditary causes, from anything you may or may not do, or from whatever may or may not happen to you. In other words: 60% of all cancers are formed at *random*.

People have been telling us for a long time that smoking, inhaling asbestos, eating red meat, sunbathing, praying to a certain deity, watching *The Simpsons* or not using whatever product they are trying to push all cause cancer - "do as we say and give us your money, or you'll die!"

Those are basically all lies, true only to an irrelevant extent.

If 60% of cancers occur randomly, this essentially means that anything you may do in your life (other than hanging a plutonium necklace around your neck or going sightseeing in Pripyat) can only

increase your odds of having one by 66% (the remaining 40%). Less, actually, since a good part of those other 40% have genetic origins and thus do not depend on your choices and actions. If you have, let's say, a 10% chance of having cancer when you are 70 years old, getting wasted your entire life, smoking cigars and sunbathing seven days a week will, at most and *statistically* speaking, increase your odds to 16.6%.

That increment is not enough to justify shackling yourself to misery instead of living your life unrestrained. So don't refrain from doing what you *want* due to a fear of developing cancer. Don't waste a moment of your life being afraid of it. If you end up having it one day, you were probably going to have it anyway, regardless of anything you did or didn't do.

From what I've read, seen and heard, here's my understanding of cancer: it happens if a certain combination of random, undesirable mutations occurs in a cell in our body.

Whenever a new cell is created, there's a small chance that a replication error will occur, altering its DNA. Radiation, particle decay and some viruses can damage our cells as well, leading to the same effect. Such genetic alterations are what allowed us and every other living being to naturally evolve. Whether by being damaged or by spontaneously mutating, sometimes a cell can be genetically encoded *not* to do what it is supposed to while also reproducing uncontrollably and being unable to repair itself, becoming cancerous. To make matters worse, for some reason our immune system fails to detect and/or destroy that cell as well, or it can't do so fast enough to beat the cell's reproduction rate once it starts multiplying. Those cells spread uncontrollably and with malign effects, becoming a tumor.

There are lots of ongoing researches on means to prevent or cure cancer. Some of them are based on genes of certain plants, animals or microscopic organisms that are more resilient than us to DNA changes. But *would* we apply such a potential cure, eradicating cancer via altering the human genome? No, because doing so could have potentially dire consequences. And it's also currently illegal.

The irony about cancer is that, to stop it, we need to stop natural evolution as well. And if we do that, we'll have to start evolving *artificially* (which is what we should do, but people can't see it yet).

And the worst thing about it is that cancer may actually not have a *perfect* solution, an ultimate cure. There may not be a way to avoid it completely and forever, because some of the random mutations our DNA suffers, as I said before, can occur due to particle decay or radiation, which simply cannot be avoided.

In any case, if you still want to do everything possible to avert having a tumor, here's what you *can* do: stop smoking. Stop eating meat. Stop eating vegetables. Stop working. Stop thinking. Stop moving. Stop breathing. Never touch sunlight again. Make sure none of the cells in your body are ever used and spent – that none of them ever dies, so that no new ones have to be born – then lock yourself inside an anti-radiation bunker and pray that the half-life of every atom in your body will be greater than your remaining life span. Since none of that is viable, the only guaranteed way to avoid having cancer is to *die*.

If you don't yet want to die, just live your life as you see fit. Eat, drink, smoke, snort and shoot whatever you want. If you are bound to have cancer one day, you'll most likely have it anyway. Trying to do anything to avoid it is a waste of time, a waste of life.

And the next time someone tells you something gives cancer, take the opportunity to laugh at them. Laughing is healthy (and someone, somewhere, will probably even tell you it *lowers* your odds of developing a tumor).

Super Aging

Doctors have now taken to calling those who manage to get past the age of 80 without becoming senile “super agers.” “Super aging,” then, is *how* to achieve that, and this seems to generate some confusion. Since many of us are going to get to that age and the vast majority of those who do will become senile, I thought I should clarify how this thing actually works.

Super aging consists in using the brain so that it doesn't atrophy due to... well, lack of usage. But you must use your brain *hard* for it to have any effect – you must do something *different*. Doing more of what you have always done has no effect. The premise is that you must create new neurological pathways, and using the same ones

you've always used doesn't do that. Doing crossword puzzles won't help you, because you have done plenty of them in the past and you are quite familiar with your native language and its vocabulary. Playing a new song on the guitar won't do the trick if you are a guitarist. Doing your job, whatever it is, won't work because you'll just be thinking about and doing the things you are already used to.

To actually super age, you must *learn*. Doing things you are familiar with is easy, but doing something you've never done before is hard, and herein lies the problem. By the time we're 25, we're already sick and tired of learning things, because up until then that's pretty much everything we've ever done in our lives. So imagine how people feel about it when they are 60, 70, 80 years old - *no one* is willing to do that anymore.

Learning is hard, and we don't like things that are so. Thus, we don't do them. We do things that are easy for us and let other people do the things that are hard for us but easy for them. Throughout our lives, we hardly ever find enough motivation to do a *single* thing that requires real effort and dedication, something that requires withstanding prolonged suffering and overcoming a ton of frustrations. If nothing forces us to or rewards us greatly for doing such a thing, we simply don't, because anything that can be accurately defined as "hard" is too unpleasant for it to be worth doing.

What we all eventually become is old people who are sick and tired of everything, who do not have enough motivation to do anything, and for whom all things are also harder than for everyone else (since being old we are, inevitably, already physically deteriorated and mentally exhausted). And then we need to force ourselves to overcome all that and learn how to do something new, something completely unrelated to anything we've ever done before and that even in our prime we weren't willing to do. We must suddenly rejuvenate seventy years, adopting the avid mentality of a curious 5 year-old on their first day in school (except without the ominous sense of abandonment, the morbid realization that our days of doing what we want are over forever, and all the ensuing crying, yelling and suicidal thoughts). Who the hell is going to pull that out?

Nearly no one does, and hence why virtually all of us become senile if we live long enough.

But you might be one of the scarce few who are willing to try. You might even be one of those who can actually succeed, because you

really don't want to spend your last ten years on Earth not understanding what the TV is saying, getting lost inside your own home, soiling yourself every time you have to use the toilet, needing help to get a spoon into your mouth, and either ruining your sons' and daughters' lives or paying a hefty monthly sum for someone else (who'll beat you whenever nobody's watching) to provide you with the constant assistance and supervision you'll require.

If you've made up your mind and you don't want to spend the last five to ten years of your life staring at the wall while you constantly drool on an ecru-colored plaid shirt, here are a few examples of things you can do to avoid such fate:

- Learn a new language;
- Learn how to play a musical instrument;
- Learn to dance;
- Learn to juggle;
- Download Blender and teach yourself how to build 3D models;
- Download Visual Studio and teach yourself how to code;
- Look up some MIT math, engineering and physics classes online and take them;
- Do everything with your left hand (if you are right-handed).

In short, work your brain in a way you never did before. Do something you know nothing about and have no talent whatsoever for. If you feel a headache after an hour or so doing an activity for the first few times, it's working (I'm serious, you *do* get a headache. I've been there). If you don't, it's probably not, and then you must find something harder to do.

Start doing this stuff when you are 50, 60 years old at most. If you go as far as 70 without it, you'll no longer have the mental strength required to even *begin*. You'll fail too soon, too often and too hard, and thus give up way too quickly for anything to have any effect.

Otherwise, you can do what I've done and find a way to make sure you won't *live* that long, so that you don't have to do all that crap, guaranteeing you won't be a drag to anyone and still be sane when you die.

To end on a lighter note: do you look like a walking corpse, or maybe a cancer hospital escapee? Does the Sun hate you with all candor, and the only color other than snow-white your skin ever had was a scalding baby-pink?

If so, that makes two of us. And now your vampire days may finally be over!

If you ever manage to temporarily avert all ailments and find a fleeting moment to briefly bask in the Sun's scorching light, here's what you have to do *before* jumping into a garish, obscene swimsuit and voluntarily subjecting yourself to a burning torture: *drink some beet and carrot juice*.

Only once did I manage to look like I had some actual life in me, and that was the trick to it. (I only did it once because I forgot to do it again. It slipped my mind for some twenty years.)

I just Googled about it to confirm and, while I have been thinking beet and carrot *increase* the amount on melanin on human skin, the internet says they do the exact opposite – it says they both *lower* it. And what that means is that I have no idea how tanning actually works. Nonetheless, I know for a fact that the “Magic Juice” does – I once spent two weeks on the beach with some friends and we all drank it every day in the morning, except for one guy: the other who was as cadaveric as me. When we returned, I looked Latin (minus the mustache and bandana) and he still looked freshly risen from the grave.

So, go for it! After infusing yourself with beets and carrots and sauteing directly under an astronomical fusion reactor for a few days, you'll finally have a shot at being welcomed with open arms in “da hood,” homie.

And don't forget to take the opportunity to hit the gym after playing wingless Icarus, because sunbathing temporarily increases testosterone levels by a considerable amount.

CHAPTER VI: Life Stories

I shall now share a few particularly interesting things that happened to me, personally. If at any point it doesn't sound like it, I assure you: these stories are true.

I will start off with the most mundane one, which made the cut because of the lesson it carries.

The Fly

I was sitting at my computer one evening when a fly came in through the window. Instead of going for the light bulb and burning itself to death or just hanging on the wall, like most flies do, this one kept flying around, pestering me. It took something like 15 seconds before I ran out of patience, got up, and started chasing it around.

I picked up a shoe, approached the fly as it idled for a few peaceful seconds on the wall, and swatted at it as quickly as I could. But the thing managed to eke itself away from my crushing blow, and then set off on a victory lap around my bedroom. A few more similar and just as unsuccessful attempts followed, until I decided to outsmart it instead of using brute force.

As the fly went on about its doodling business, now on another wall, I stood far away and, this time, *hurled* my shoe at it. Alas, to no avail. All that did was to make it relocate – this time, to land on my window's pane. I couldn't throw something on glass, so I tried a subtle approach instead. I slowly moved my shoe towards the fly, lest she'd get aware of my intentions and flee once more. But my last movement had to be somewhat swift, or the fly would escape anyway. And that son of a... of another fly, I guess, simply wouldn't budge. My shoe was almost touching it, yet the damn bug sat calmly in place. And that's when I got the strange feeling that it *knew* I wasn't going to hit glass with any considerable force. If I tried to hit it just slightly fast (rather than fast enough), the fly trusted itself to be agile enough to evade the blow. And so did I.

It felt like I was playing a chess match. And my king was in check.

Trying to solve the situation with at least some dignity left, I cheated. I'm not proud of it, but... I grabbed a can of Raid and sprayed it over the fly for at least twice as long as it would be necessary to kill it. And that was how it finally failed to avoid its inevitable fate.

I congratulated myself with an oh-so-satisfying “Take that, bitch!” as the fly dizzied around, struggling against the havoc being wreaked in its nervous system, just as my pizza arrived. I crossed my bedroom, laid my shoe down by the door, and went to eat.

When I returned, some fifteen minutes later, I heard a buzz. The fly, I instantly knew, was still alive somewhere. Somewhere *nearby*.

I turned the lights on and immediately spotted it. The fly was convulsing on the floor, about an inch away from the very shoe that had tried so many times to kill it, as if begging for it to do so. I grabbed my shoe as fast as I could and squashed the poor thing out of its misery.

And that’s when I had an epiphany.

That fly teased me into trying to kill it, refusing to leave my room (my window had always been wide open), knowing it would manage to escape my blunt murdering efforts. It dared me to hit the glass on the window, knowing I wouldn’t. By the end, after enduring fifteen minutes of unbearable suffering (which is probably the equivalent to a week or so to a human) caused by the insecticide, the fly used all of its remaining strength to bring itself to land near my shoe, knowing it represented a more merciful death. In agony, the fly abdicated its humane pride and begged its arch-nemesis (me) to kill it, knowing I was a sentient being who would understand the request when I saw it lying next to my lethal shoe. I had killed my fair share of flies before, but that one seemed to be particularly intelligent – way more than I ever thought a fly could be.

That’s the event that made me realize that *human suffering is not worse or more important than any other species’*.

That may sound stupid to some and, at the same time, obvious to others. It’s easier to see it when we are talking about cats and dogs, harder when talking about worms and spiders. The story I just told may not be enough to change anyone’s mind, but when something like that happens to you, when you get a clear feeling that a being that small is thinking and acting on a rather complex, even strategic level, and also communicating with you in a certain way, it changes your perspective – it increases your appreciation for life in general, and diminishes the one you have for human beings in particular.

I’m one of those people who find insects particularly disgusting. I don’t like them, at all. But ever since that episode, I’ve only killed those who are actively pestering me, only used insecticides as a last

resort and, when I do, I always try to find where the bug fell and kill them as quickly and swiftly as possible. With insects that allow it, now I try to pick them up (with a piece of paper), take them to the window and release them outside. I even let a baby moth climb directly on my finger once! It was naive to interact with a human, but I honored its misplaced trust by gently taking the moth outside and softly blowing it into the wind. That was a bonding moment I remember fondly. I hope Lil' Moth is okay.

Anyway, I believe The Fly Incident made me a slightly better person. Thanks to it, I've avoided causing a lot of suffering that I otherwise would have. To insects - which is the same as to anyone else.

Why harm *any* living being when we can avoid it?

As a side note: in case you are interested, there's a great documentary called *My Octopus Teacher* about the relationship a diver developed with an octopus. It's one of the top-rated documentaries on IMDb. It's also eye-opening, touching, and it makes you want to kill anyone who tries to harm one such creature (and the sociopath protagonist of the documentary too, multiple times, for reasons I won't spoil).

I get pissed now when I see people *eating* octopuses. And I think I finally get why the Greenpeace and other similar NGOs were founded (a bit late, I admit). I can finally *feel* what motivates those people.

Exorcism

I had this nightmare once, when I was 17. It was one of those rare ones that feel *real*. I had four or five of those in a single [very bad] week, not a single one of them before or after that, and what follows was the last nightmare of that series.

In the dream, I went into my kitchen. Two friends who studied with me at the time were there. One of them sat on a stool, while the other leaned against the counter.

As I came inside, I noticed the one sitting down had some kind of problem. He looked deranged, completely out of it. Within seconds, he started crying.

I turned to my other friend and asked, "What happened?" And he replied, "Can't you see it? He fucked up."

Until then, I had a feeling my sitting friend actually represented *me*. After that, I was sure of it.

Soon, he began sobbing uncontrollably. He put his hands around his head, as if trying to keep himself grounded while sinking into despair. And then, all of a sudden, everything went dark.

I spent a couple of seconds standing in pure darkness, until my despairing friend's head appeared out of nowhere, right beside mine, staring directly at me from half an inch away. He wasn't crying anymore. He was just... eerie.

The floating head stood there just long enough to scare the living crap out of me (about two seconds) and then vanished.

A couple more seconds went by, and then I felt myself lying down, with my eyes closed. I was *awake*, but I couldn't open my eyelids or move any part of my body. This happens to people sometimes, but that was the only time it ever happened to me. I was lying on my back, with my knees bent towards the ceiling, and never had I slept or waked in that position.

Shortly afterwards, I noticed something else was wrong: I could feel someone inside my mind, lurking, trying to take control. Or rather *already* in control, because I seemed more distant, to myself, than him.

Somehow, I didn't panic. Instinctively, I thought, "You're not staying here, dude," and started trying to force him out. How, exactly, I'm not sure. But it worked.

I had barely started trying when I heard a scream inside my head, one that sounded as if it had come straight out of a horror movie, very loud and perfectly clear: "AAAAARRRRRGGGHHHHhhhhh...!"

Just like that, whoever the hell that was, he was gone – and in pain as well, I like to think. And then, as soon as my possessor's scream faded out, I started seeing *colorful, shining lights*.

I saw many bright, concentric circles spinning around each other, incessantly changing colors as they moved around. I wasn't simply imagining things, I could really see it. It was quite pretty. And for as long as that vision lasted, I felt something I had never felt before: absolute peace and safety. I felt literally *immortal*.

I remember wondering, while that phenomenon was still going on, "What would happen if I got stabbed right now?" and I honestly believed nothing would. I was *sure* nothing in the entire universe could harm me then, in any way. Maybe I could be shot, blown up, catch on fire; but then and there I knew, more certainly than I've ever known anything, that I could not be actually harmed or destroyed, no matter what. Whatever happened, I knew it would be fine; I knew that I would remain intact.

That's the best memory I have. It was by far the best thing I ever felt.

Sadly, the colorful lights and sense of immortality only lasted for ten seconds or so. They quickly started to fade as I struggled to try and hold onto them. If it was up to me, I would never have come back.

As soon as nothing but darkness remained, my eyes opened and I was able to move normally once again.

The following day, at school, I ran into a friend of mine - the one who was leaning against the counter in my dream. He could tell there was something wrong with me, so he asked, "What happened?" and I said, "Nothing." He paused and stared at me for a little while. "You fucked up," he somehow deduced. I just frowned and said, "Huh. I dreamt about you saying that."

I have wondered whether that episode was *real*, if it was a sign that something more exists out there, perhaps even an afterlife. And I believe it was. I don't think it was simply a fiction generated by my brain, because there doesn't seem to be a reasonable biological explanation for it.

Natural evolution follows a single thread, only one guideline: survivability. It aims to make living organisms continue to live, and nothing else. That which manages to do so continues to exist, while that which doesn't becomes extinct. Every single cell of any living organism was created for that purpose, and that purpose alone. With that being so, how is it possible that a mechanism exists in the

human brain that can make us feel immortal? This goes diametrically opposite to the goals and rules of evolution, directly violating its most fundamental principle since that feeling can easily and very quickly lead one to die (I *would* have stabbed myself if I could move while I felt immortal, just out of curiosity).

Also, why would I (or possibly all of us) be genetically programmed for something that happens once in a lifetime and without any concrete consequences? In practical terms, such a thing is useless. It serves no purpose and doesn't help us with anything. Such a phenomenon shouldn't be possible, just as whatever caused it surviving for millions of years until it finally manifested in me shouldn't happen either.

Multiple neurological mechanisms must have been involved in generating what I saw and felt, causing a very specific reaction to a once-in-a-lifetime event. The colorful lights I saw followed a pattern, and the sense of immortality was probably the strongest and clearest thing I have ever felt. If they were caused by a random, pointless [genetic] accident, the result should have been a random, pointless mess as well. But it wasn't.

The most logical explanation I can imagine for what happened is a brain tumor. But that event occurred more than twenty years ago, I'm still here, and nothing even remotely like it ever happened to me again.

I don't care about the possession. Albeit extremely weird, that might have been strictly psychological and entirely irrelevant. Or not. But it's the lights and the immortality that puzzle me. I was awake, what happened *really* happened, I don't know why, and I cannot explain how.

Since that night, I have believed that there are things out there (and within us) that we know nothing about. And I know for a fact that at least one of them is *far* better than anything we are familiar with in this life.

Recently, I decided to look it up to see if other people had related any similar events. And they have. It turns out that what I experienced commonly happens to people who go through near-death experiences.

Currently, my best theory is that some DMT (dimethyltryptamine, a psychedelic substance that can be naturally synthesized by the human brain and is called “the Spirit molecule” or “the God molecule” by some) was probably released in my brain.

As to *why* the human brain is even capable of synthesizing DMT, it remains a mystery.

Exploding Head

Many years ago, on a random night and as I was trying to sleep, another weird event occurred.

While teetering on the verge of unconsciousness, just as I transitioned between the awake and asleep states, I was suddenly re-awakened by a loud *explosion*. I heard it in my left ear only and I instantly knew that, whatever that was, it was happening inside my head. As such, it didn’t startle me nearly as much as it otherwise would have. But it was a perfect explosion: the noise with all of its details, loud, clear, bursting up and then fading out.

Two seconds after the explosion silenced, I heard a *lightning strike* in my other ear. Once again the sound was perfect, detailed, clear, very loud.

Two seconds after the lightning strike silenced, my heart rate suddenly jumped from 50 BPM or so to about 200. It started to slow down on its own soon afterwards, and within a minute it had already normalized.

On the following morning, I went on the internet to see if anyone ever had a similar experience. Many people have, this phenomenon seems to be somewhat common, and it even has a name: “*exploding head syndrome*.”

No one knows why or how, exactly, it happens. According to Wikipedia, “potential explanations include ear problems, temporal lobe seizure, nerve dysfunction, or specific genetic changes.” To some people, it happens very often; to others, a few times. To me, it only happened once.

As I looked for information about it, I ran into a text written by a guy who had gone through the same thing. What is particularly strange, in his case, is that the event happened both to him *and* his mother within a one week span, and it had never happened to either one of them before.

It may not sound like much – and it may in fact not be – but it’s quite an interesting experience when it happens to you. It’s really weird.

In my case, as the noises were still going on inside my brain, I had the impression that I was being probed somehow. Yes – as in “probed by aliens.” I didn’t really have time to think, it was just my instinctive interpretation of it: “This feels like some alien shit.” I doubt it myself but, to be completely honest, I’m not entirely sure that wasn’t the case. It was all too well-choreographed, too perfectly timed, too... non-random.

In any case, I don’t believe the “exploding head” is in any way related to the lights and immortality I mentioned in the previous topic. Whereas in that one what I saw and felt were all *new* to me, in the present event the sounds were familiar, as was having a high heartbeat.

This one may actually just be the result of some neurological issue, even though it’s still very strange, as is the fact that it only happened once in my life, when I was completely sober, while asleep, and on a night no different from any other.

Remote Non-Contact

My personal experiences with UFOs aren’t quite out of this world, but I’m going to use them as an excuse to comment on the subject.

Many years ago, I was having a smoke by the window, at about 1:00 a.m., when I saw a distant light traversing the sky. I had it in my sight for about two minutes. It moved rather quickly – faster than an airplane could, considering the [assumed] distance – straight to the left and then stopped, hovering in place for a while. Then it went straight back to the right, and I lost track of it after it moved behind a distant building.

Airplanes and helicopters aren't allowed to fly at that hour, here. It also couldn't be an airplane because, obviously, one cannot hover in place. And their lights always blink, while this one didn't. The light I saw was too fast and bright to be a helicopter as well; it couldn't possibly have been a balloon; and Drones weren't yet available by then. So, I don't know. To me, that flying object was unidentified.

I witnessed a more interesting event about five years ago (even though there was no actual sighting involved), when a strange sound woke me up at about 1:30 a.m.

It was a "Phewww! Phewww!" sound, something between a whistle and a sci-fi laser beam, and it was *loud*. The only other time a sound coming from outside was ever loud enough to wake me up happened when some robbers blew up a bank agency about half a kilometer away from my place with an excessive amount of explosives.

After hearing about a dozen pairs of "strikes," I got up and went to the window to find out what was going on.

The sound seemed to be coming from somewhere on the streets. It was always a double "Phewww!" and the intervals between each one of these and between each pair of them both seemed to be perfectly constant. More disturbing, though, is the fact that each "double strike" came from a different spot within one kilometer or so in front of me, and seemingly at random - i.e., one seemed to come from 500 meters away; the next from 200 meters; the third from 900. And their *volume* was always the same, regardless of the distance, which makes me wonder how I could even tell they were coming from varying distances. But I could, somehow (and we can detect the *direction* of a sound anyway).

I also felt no tremor or any vibration either, even when one of the "strikes" occurred about 30 meters away from me.

As I looked out the window, I kept following the sound with my eyes, but never spotted anything - no lights, no machinery, no gathering of people, nothing.

I couldn't figure out what that was. I still don't know. But at the time, my best guess was that I was hallucinating. Since this happened *after* the "self-exorcism" and the "exploding head" events, I wondered.

That theory went down the drain on the following morning, when I asked my mother if she had heard something strange during the night and she said the sound had also waked her. She went to the window to find out what was causing it too but, like me, couldn't spot anything.

I asked a few other people who live within a five kilometer radius if they heard it, and none did. A neighbor of mine said he heard shooting, but the sound was, with absolute certainty, not gunfire. It was nothing even remotely similar to it, so my neighbor might have been high (or perhaps the sound was actually different to him. But this is too far-fetched a theory).

I asked on Quora if anyone had any ideas as to what could have caused the noise. One guy suggested it might have had something to do with the sea, with the tide. But that made no sense, and the sea is some 70 kilometers away from here. No one offered a second hypothesis.

My only explanation for what happened is some kind of alien... something. I'm not aware of anything on this planet that could cause a sound with the properties I described, whereas a large UFO overhead could at least make it come from a different spot each time, while perhaps explaining how the volume never changed and how no one outside a certain radius seems to have been able to hear it, even though how loud it was dictates they should.

More recently, I saw something else I can't quite explain.

Just as I laid down to sleep, at about 1:40 a.m. (it's a bit strange that all three events happened at roughly the same time), I stared out the window and a green light in the sky caught my eyes. It drew my attention because I didn't remember ever seeing a *green* light on any airplanes or helicopters, and also because it was particularly bright.

A second, yellow light was near it and, given their respective positions, despite the first one's color I initially dismissed it as an airplane anyway – those might have been the lights under one's wings, even though they were odd.

But then I realized they weren't moving.

I proceeded to dismiss the yellow light as a star (a particularly bright one that somehow I had never noticed before, despite only six or so of them being visible, here, beyond the smog) and focused on the

green one. I got up, went to the window and kept looking at it, trying to discern the shape of whatever kept that green light in the air. But I saw nothing.

And then, as I was looking directly at them, the two lights *fired* something.

From the darkness in between them, a new red-yellow light appeared and divided itself in two. A pair of *fireballs* started flying slowly apart, on an arced downward trajectory. Immediately after those two balls of fire appeared, the green light moved straight upwards, all the way out of sight, very quickly, while the yellow one moved about half as fast to the left and then stopped in the air, a safe distance away from their initial position. The two lights weren't part of the same object – there were two of them.

As I watched the newly-formed pair of fireballs falling across the sky, I honestly thought they were some kind of bombs or missiles (even though they didn't behave quite like either). But I kept staring at them nonetheless, for a total of ten seconds or so, until they moved out of my sight. The fireballs looked like comets: two red-yellow balls involved in flame, extending a short conical trail behind them.

Since the fireballs' speed and vector didn't match that of missiles or bombs, I then assumed they must have been some kind of fireworks. But for as long as I had my eyes on them, their burning didn't diminish at all. They seemed to have plenty of fuel, and all the fireworks I've ever seen that were remotely similar to those things burned out *very* quickly.

I waited for a little while longer after I lost sight of the two balls of fire, expecting them to hit the ground and for me to hear an explosion. But that didn't happen – I didn't hear anything before they appeared, when they did, as they fell, or when they supposedly crashed somewhere.

I went to the living room and told my mother to look outside. The fireballs and the green light had all gone out of sight, but the yellow one remained.

"Oh, that's a balloon," she said. And then the light, which had been moving slowly around the same area in the sky, stopped in place. Then it moved a little to the right, and stopped again. Then a second light suddenly appeared next to it, apparently a part of the same object, and it started blinking red and white. My mother reconsidered, "Yeah. No, that's not a balloon." Then I told her about

the green light and the fireballs, but she didn't seem to get it or to believe me.

So, I saw two objects that didn't behave like balloons, helicopters or airplanes immediately flying *very quickly* apart after they *fired* a pair of slow-moving fireballs towards the ground.

They might have been drones, since I don't know exactly what these things are capable of doing these days, and despite the fact that they are very costly here and also that I've never personally seen one flying around. But what did they shoot out? How was it fired from *in between* them, out of something that should but could not be seen (though smoggy, the night was otherwise pretty clear, with zero clouds in the sky)?

It might have been two police helicopters aiding some search party on the ground, firing flares (though I've never seen these being used around here either). But given how bright the lights were, if they belonged to a couple of helicopters I should have been able to see the aircrafts themselves. And if what they fired were flares, everything nearby would have become illuminated - including the very objects that fired them. Also, why would the two objects fly immediately apart after the fireballs appeared? How did these move so slowly, if they were falling? How did the green light fly straight up, so fast and all the way out of sight? Where did it go? Why did the other remain? Why didn't I *hear* anything at all?

It was strange.

My best guess is that it all happened *much* farther than it seemed. I can't explain the fireballs' trajectory in any other way, as it didn't match gravity's pull on a nearby object. However silly it may sound, my best guess is that what I saw were two UFOs getting together to break apart a meteor entering Earth's atmosphere, so that its smaller halves would burn out before reaching the ground. Maybe it was going to cause some damage, so they blew it up. But I didn't *initially* see anything resembling a comet - there was only darkness between the two lights until the fireballs themselves showed up. They appeared out of nowhere. It could be, perhaps, that the meteor was "destroyed" while still outside our atmosphere. If not that, my next best guess is that the weird lights actually blew up a *third*, lightless UFO.

I would like to talk a little more about aliens.

I have experienced what I mentioned, I have heard a rather convincing close-contact UFO tale from a friend (a fast-moving ball of light flew toward and jumped right over his father's car, with three more people inside witnessing the event), and I have seen many people on the TV conveying their own stories about such objects – a lot of civilian and military pilots, a former Canadian minister of defense, a former high official of the Chinese government, astronauts, members of the US Navy, a bunch of unrelated people claiming to have seen the same odd thing at the same time, etc. We have all heard such stories.

For starters and statistically speaking, the chances that there are, indeed, “other” (I'm not sure if we fit this description) intelligent and advanced species out there, in our universe, is 100%. Maybe it's better to put it like this: the odds that we are the only ones are *one in infinite*.

Although we don't yet fully understand how organic life is formed, roughly all it seems to need to sprout is hydrogen, oxygen, carbon, a few more non-heavy elements, and an energy source. Non-heavy elements are all very common in our universe. There are many, many stars (an energy source) in space, every one of them is orbited by planets, planetoids or at least some debris, and they also all have a habitable zone (a region where the temperature is high enough to maintain water in liquid state, allowing for chemical reactions to take place in it). So, life is bound to be *extremely* common in our universe, since the basic requirements for it to arise are abundant (advanced lifeforms must be a much rarer occurrence though, since these also require an adequate and stable environment to develop).

Amino acids – the basic blocks of life – can be found even in asteroids. They seem to be *everywhere*. Water and heat come into play to somehow unite them into proteins and, millions of years later, under not-too-dreadful conditions, those proteins manage to form cells, creating a microscopic biome protected from the outside. If these cells, in turn, aggregate into one larger organism, and this one manages to survive major global cataclysms for long enough, it eventually becomes *us*.

If we manage to survive for much longer, we'll become something else. It's only logical to assume others have gone through our current stage of evolution and that they did so a long time ago, since our universe has been up and running for more than fourteen billion years, which is far more than enough for life to have developed way

beyond the current human level of evolution somewhere else in the cosmos.

With that in mind, and with so many reports from so many different sources about UFO sightings, the odds that at least *some* of them are true are quite high. And given that a single one of those cases being true would be enough, let's assume aliens are out there - and out *here*. Then, a natural question emerges: why are they interested in our planet and/or us?

If the aliens wanted something such as natural resources or even our entire planet for themselves, they could easily have taken it from us ages ago. Given that any foreign species capable of visiting our planet has existed, been evolving and developing for thousands, if not millions or billions of years longer than us, we wouldn't stand *any* chance against them. We know what the Europeans did to the indigenous people of the Americas with only steel, gunpowder and a more developed immunological system as an upper hand, so it's not hard to imagine how things would turn out if an alien species decided to attack us. If they ever want to wipe us out, they will wipe us out - now or a trillion years in the future, since they will *always* be ahead of us.

The fact that aliens haven't yet exterminated us indicates they are not after Earth or its natural resources. And this, in turn, may imply a few things:

- 1 - There are many inhabitable planets out there, and ours is nothing special;
- 2 - At least some alien species have long mastered terraforming, being able to turn a massive piece of dead rock into any lush biome of their choosing;
- 3 - All chemical elements found on Earth can be easily found elsewhere in the universe, thus not making our planet particularly enticing either;
- 4 - It's possible to perfectly recycle anything and/or artificially produce any element, making a hostile takeover of an entire planet for material reasons unnecessary;
- 5 - And/or the extraterrestrials don't need or want to expand to new planets, because enough is enough.

My guess is those are all true.

With some reports of abductions (even though these are the hardest ones to believe) going around, it could be possible that aliens are here to *study* us. Not because we are special or particularly interesting, but simply because we are yet another slightly different species among billions or trillions of others that they are already familiar with; yet another pseudo-random result of our universe's chemistry. Maybe we are even identical to others, but at least our society, as a result of humanity's particular fate, is bound to be unique.

Maybe aliens see Earth as a zoo or a freak show. They might bring their kids here to watch us throwing feces at each other, so that they can learn via practical examples how *not* to behave.

Maybe we are a nearly identical, real-time representation of their own distant past, so they watch us out of historical curiosity.

Maybe they let us be in the off-chance that, one day, we may accidentally discover something they haven't yet, so that they can learn or extract it from us at some point in the distant future.

Maybe they gamble over our species, betting on whether we'll survive the invention of nuclear weapons, the first super-virus pandemic we run into (or accidentally unleash upon ourselves [again]), the rise of AI, the next large meteor that shows up on a collision course with Earth, or the eventual death of our Sun. These are all events that must have happened to many of them in the past and will continue happening to innumerable others all over the universe.

Maybe they keep a watch on Earth in case blind luck doesn't save us from one of those scenarios. If we verge on nuking the entire planet, spreading a highly predatory disease throughout space or creating self-replicating terminators, they might come in and scorch our planet's surface to make sure our crap doesn't end up contaminating *their* galaxy.

Maybe, given the amount of blood-drained cows found all over the world with pieces of their jaws removed, some of the aliens have cloned these animals to be able to enjoy juicy hamburgers, just like we do. Or they needed an animal that could naturally produce large amounts of methane to fulfill some particular end in one of their many planets.

Maybe they are waiting for us to unify our species, organize, focus, evolve and finally become qualified to expand beyond our home

planet to reveal themselves. Then, they'll tell us what their laws are and exactly how humanity is going to be exterminated if we violate them.

Once again, I believe those are all true at once (I'm not so sure about the cows).

There's one more interesting thing about aliens.

Reports, if we believe them, suggest there are *several* different extraterrestrial species roaming around Earth and, if humans serve as an indication of "intelligent" behavior, they may not all be nice and friendly.

In my country, about fifty years ago, dozens of people from a small town in the middle of nowhere ended up in the hospital with severe skin burns caused by "lasers shooting out of lights in the sky" (that's how the victims themselves described it)¹⁸. One man died of a heart attack after simply spotting the lights, which means they must have been at the very least unusual, if not blood-freezing eerie.

Some of the aliens may be just high-tech idiots who roam the galaxy looking for some poor primates to play laser-tag with. Or they could be conducting small tests to see what kills us more easily, in case the need to exterminate us arises. In any case, these aliens in particular don't seem to care too much about our well-being. If it were up to those guys, we might be long dead by now. And this could mean the *others* are keeping them in check.

From that, I infer all those aliens species are part of a single governing system - a "Galactic Federation," if you will. They all agreed (or were forced) to follow the same set of rules, and they all probably police each other because, when you have multiple intelligent species (or races) sharing the same territory, this naturally leads to either a coalition or war (followed by partial genocide, a winner, and relative albeit temporary peace).

"The Federation's" law, as it pertains to us, seems to be: "you may experiment on, but not maim, kill or otherwise permanently damage primitive self-aware lifeforms. You cannot interfere with the workings of their society or provide them with new technology without the Galactic Federation's telepathic consent."

¹⁸ Wikipedia entry: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opera%C3%A7%C3%A3o_Prato (Accessed in March, 2024. There isn't much information available in *English*.)

A group of species, all of them a lot wiser and far more technologically advanced than ours, *agreed* to let us keep on living. And whatever their reasons are, these are probably better than our own.

That may support the theory that messing everything up as we have been doing since we exist is inevitable. If we had in fact already messed up *too hard* and nothing but further suffering awaited us in the future, reason dictates our alien overlords should have already killed us all, both for safety reasons and out of mercy.

Or perhaps we did already set ourselves on a path towards extinction, but they are willing to fix this for us when the time is right.

If they actually give a damn, that is.

Parallel Development

I once tried to write a screenplay. A few, to be more accurate (before I learned I lack the required talents).

One of them started with the protagonist waking up from his own death, tied to a high-tech operating table. We saw things from his perspective, as the entire movie was supposed to be shot in first-person.

A blond woman – a doctor – noticing he was finally awake, came up to the hero and started evaluating him. After a little while, he looked down to realize his entire body was now cybernetic. I scrapped that one after a couple dozen pages or so. But somewhere between twelve and eighteen months later, *Hardcore Henry* was released – a movie that has a scene that is *very* similar to what I had written roughly one year before. And, “coincidentally,” it’s also one of the very few movies around that were shot in first-person perspective (and probably the one with the largest budget ever).

As I looked around and read some books and screenplays, studying a bit before trying to write one of my own, I found a website written by Terry Rossio – one of the *Pirates of the Caribbean* authors¹⁹ (I’m not particularly fan of the movies themselves but, as a writer, the guy is

¹⁹ **Site:** wordplayer.com (Accessed in February, 2024)

brilliant). In one of the many articles he wrote there, Mr. Rossio mentioned an occasion when, while working as a reader in Hollywood, he received three very similar scripts in the same week. They were all about murderous triplets or something of the sort. He never got any other similarly-themed screenplays before or after that, found it strange, and introduced me to the term “parallel development” (a term that is also used in software engineering but which, in the present context, means “multiple, completely unrelated people unaware of each other coming up with the same idea at the same time”).

The triplets’ case is an example of that: three different people, each looking for inspiration to write their own spec script, probably saw something on the TV related to triplets and decided to make things interesting by adding murder to it. Whatever they watched only aired once or twice, so the authors all saw it pretty much at the same time. They all wanted to write something, adopted the idea, and started working on it. The three of them finished their scripts at roughly the same time and dispatched these to be appraised. And their three spec scripts somehow also ended up in the same reader’s hands.

Alternatively, those authors may *not* have seen anything about triplets in the news at all, and their three scripts could be a complete coincidence. It’s possible, but even more unlikely.

Regardless of how much of a coincidence the triplets case was, it wasn’t an isolated occurrence, as we’ve seen in “Me V. *Hardcore Henry*.” If *Hardcore Henry* was released between a year and a year and a half after I started writing my own screenplay, it means there’s a good chance its author started writing his at around the same time I did. When I/we did so, there was nothing notorious going on about cybernetic implants, the sci-fi genre stood where it always has, and first-person movies were nearly as rare then as they are now. And that’s on top of the semi-identical scene we both wrote. There was nothing to give either one of us that particular idea at that time, and yet both of us, geographically thousands of miles apart, thought almost exactly the same thing and used it to the same end.

There must be numerous similar cases out there. There are, for instance, several patents for inventions that were filed *days* apart by different and completely unrelated creators. (In technology-related cases, though, there’s a linear expectancy of development, such as “after inventing microchips, people naturally start working on smaller microchips.”)

Personally, I believe the evidence suggests we are able to somehow exchange thoughts with other people, even at great distances. Maybe if two of us start thinking *hard* about the same subject, and do so for long enough, we somehow “sync up.” Maybe some electrons inside person A’s brain end up entangled with electrons inside person B’s. Or maybe they were already entangled to start with. I don’t know. But *something* seems to happen.

If nothing else, just try to keep this in mind while reading the final chapter of this text, a few pages ahead.

Two brief notes [somewhat] related to movies:

First, the book *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, by Joseph Campbell – which Hollywood is quite fond of – is ridiculous. The core point it defends is false, and the arguments used to do so deeply flawed.

Second, I think we are running out of stories to tell, of songs to compose, of things to say. Given how limited our emotional triggers, the sounds we hear, and the ideas we are capable of having are, by now we’ve explored almost everything that can evoke a meaningful response in the human brain. I imagine our creative output will grow very repetitive, if not completely stale in the near future.

Having seen, listened to, played or otherwise enjoyed the greatest successes our species *currently* has to offer, by the time one reaches 30 there’s already nothing truly new to do, see or feel. By then, everything becomes just a variation of a previous experience, causing our creative and artistic creations to lose most of their appeal.

Déjà Vu

I’ve heard that déjà vu is just a flaw in our brain that happens when it’s trying to reorganize an old memory. Science says it’s a neurological “bug.” But perhaps it’s more than that.

I once had a déjà vu when I was getting into my car. I was about to take it out of the parking spot when I suddenly remembered having been there and looking to my right. As I remembered that a fraction

of a second before it actually happened, I deliberately decided to look *left* instead. And so I did, causing what I had “déjà-vued” *not* to come to pass.

I think that was the last déjà vu I ever had, and it happened some fifteen years ago.

I wonder if I actually *changed* the future by not doing what I was supposed to, taking myself off of a predetermined path I have lived dozens, thousands, maybe millions or trillions of times in the past.

That’s crazy, I know. But... *maybe*.

Even though I just looked left instead of right – which in itself is completely inconsequential – if I hadn’t done so I wouldn’t, for instance, be writing about it right now.

In case our universe has been repeating itself, Bang after Bang without *any* modifications, thanks to that simple head turn I may for the first time (or technically the second) be living a life I never lived before. And maybe that’s why I never had a déjà vu again: because I cannot possibly remember something *new*.

There’s a Netflix’s series called *Dark* whose whole story hinges on a premise related to what I just said, to things I’ve said before, and to others that I’m still going to talk about. (The following may contain *spoilers* about the series.)

Dark’s authors are clearly smart people, given how extraordinarily convoluted its story is. And they used déjà vus when characters recognized situations that had, indeed, happened to them before.

When we have unusual ideas, we doubt ourselves. We instinctively seek some kind of validation from others. We need someone *else* to be able to see what we see to be sure that our reasoning itself hasn’t been compromised. And *Dark* may have done that for me in the present case.

What I said about me possibly having changed fate is not as absurd as it may sound. Technically, it’s not implausible – as far as we humans know, the *possibility* I actually did so exists.

To those who have watched the series, if we adopt *Dark’s* grim perspective déjà vus become more interesting because, if we are stuck in an infinite loop, and that phenomenon indeed represents a

brief recognition of our past, identical lives, then we can break this “infinite” cycle.

If we are stuck in some kind of hell, as *Dark* pretty much put it, we *can* eventually get free.

Premonitions

Believe me, they are real. I’ve had three, maybe five of them. You don’t *see* something – you *feel* it. Or at least that’s how it was for me.

The first case (chronologically) is different from the others, and perhaps comparatively irrelevant as in it I *didn’t* get “the feeling.” Or maybe I did and couldn’t tell, or cannot remember. Regardless, I’ll start with it.

I was 13 or so and had gone with a friend to a store to buy some *Magic: The Gathering* packs (that’s a card game). As I started opening mine, I got some serious wishful-thinking going on, repeating inside my mind, “Come up, ‘Royal Assassin.’ Come up, ‘Royal Assassin!’”

I kept focusing and opened my packs one after the other, until I was done and... I drew nothing but trash cards. Bitterly disappointed, I started looking them over once more, to see if any of them nonetheless had some use to me. As I did, one drew my attention:

“Royal Assassin.”

It was there! I checked the cards one by one the first time around, and it wasn’t. The second time, it was. I’m not [necessarily] saying it materialized out of nowhere, but it was weird. The odds of me having skipped a card are low, and the odds of having skipped exactly that one card, knowing what it looked like and among a hundred or so, much lower. And that was a fairly rare card (I just checked: 1% chance per pack), so the odds of getting it were minimal anyway.

After showing my friend my newly acquired “Royal Assassin” – without letting him touch it, of course – we packed everything up, left the store and started walking back to our homes. I told him about how I wished for the card to be there, how it wasn’t and then it

was. The subject “premonitions” ensued and, eventually, I joked: “Imagine if two cars crashed in front of us right now!”

Some ten seconds later, we reached the next street and stopped by the crosswalk, waiting for the light to turn red.

And then two cars hit each other, right in front of us. *Frontally*.

I remember my friend turning to me and saying, “Dude... I’m afraid of you.”

I was about 15 years old the first time I *do* remember having “the feeling.” I was walking back home from the gym when I suddenly felt like I was going to run into a girl. I was thinking about something else entirely; the feeling just came out of nowhere. I noticed it, found it strange, but didn’t give it much credit even though the hypothetical meeting wouldn’t vanish from my mind.

About a minute later, as I was passing in front of an apartment building, this absolutely beautiful blond girl, about my age, came out of it – possibly the prettiest girl I had ever seen in my life. We almost bumped on each other when she stepped out.

Take a guess at what ended up happening.

Long story short, we eventually married, and we’ve just sent our fifth daughter to college. Margaret wants to be a veterinarian, and we support her.

I’m kidding, of course. You nailed it – nothing happened. We didn’t interact at all, the girl went her way, I went mine, and I never saw her again.

A few years later, an uncle of mine came to visit. He used to come by every Sunday, we got along just fine, he taught me how to play the guitar, we went surfing together and stuff. This time though, as I shook his hand, I immediately felt a wave of anger cursing through me. I got a strong feeling that something bad was about to happen, as if the day had just magically turned into night. For no reason, I suddenly *hated* the guy.

About an hour later we got into a dumb, harmless argument; my uncle assaulted me out of nowhere and tried to pin me down on the couch; I got free, punched him in the face, and made him leave.

That only temporarily damaged the relationship. He called and apologized to me a couple of days later, and everything went back to normal. But it happened.

The final premonition occurred when I was leaving a friend's place, some 3 o'clock in the morning.

I left his building, got into my car, and started my 3-minute drive home. Less than a block went by when I suddenly felt, once again, that I was going to run into some girl. This time I recognized "the feeling;" this time, I *knew* it was going to happen.

I made a detour. Instead of going straight home, I drove by my college's campus where there might still have been people out and drinking at that hour. But the place was empty, so I drove home even though "the feeling" remained.

I live in an apartment so, when I got here, I had to stop in front of the garage and wait for the gate to open. As I sat there, a taxi parked behind me, boxing me in. Here, that usually means you are about to be robbed, but I knew that wasn't the case. I drove inside, parked my car as quickly as I could and ran to the elevators. I reached the lobby at the exact same time as a hot chick, about my age and who had come out of that taxi, did.

It was the middle of the night, she looked tired, I was hammered. So I had to ask, "Hey, do you wanna go for a beer?" (I'm not *that* much of a douchebag - I only asked that *because* of "the feeling.")

And you guessed it once again: the answer was a quizzical "No?" and I never saw this girl again either (which is a bit odd, since she was entering my building alone and in the middle of the night, which implies she lived here).

That last event happened more than ten years ago. Combined, they all got me thinking, and knowing premonitions really exist can lead to some interesting thoughts.

To get the obvious out of the way first: *we can only foresee things that are inevitable.*

To be foreseen, an event must happen. If we change things and it doesn't, this means it never happened in the first place and, thus,

couldn't have been predicted. Perhaps it would be better to put it like this: only events that *can't possibly be changed* can be foreseen. And this means premonitions are useless, because if you can see the future, you can't change it; if it can be changed, you cannot see it.

Okay. Now let's fall down the rabbit hole.

The strangest thing is that, in that last case I wrote about (the "elevator girl"), foreseeing what was going to happen actually altered my actions, *causing* it to happen. If I had not taken a detour based on "the feeling," I would have arrived home a couple of minutes earlier and wouldn't have run into the girl. So not only was the causal nexus inverted, but also that future that, in theory, didn't yet exist changed the past and made *itself* possible.

Yeah. I'm not sure how to digest that either.

If a future can exist without its past or, in other words, the consequence exist before its cause, then I guess time is non-linear – it may flow both ways. Or maybe everything is concurrent, and we are just made to see it linearly so that our primitive brains can make sense of reality.

If either of the options above is correct, then the chains of causality are twice as strong as I defended when I talked about determinism. They are *doubly* unbreakable: from past to future, and from future to past.

Regardless of the intricacies of how things really work, the future does seem to have already happened. Tomorrow apparently exists somewhere, right now. Whether all or just parts of it, I can't say. But at the very least some future *information* is capable of travelling back in time to land in our present.

Or maybe that's all wrong. Instead, the girl I ran into in the elevator knew, as she rode her cab, that it would take her approximately five minutes to reach her destination and *this* information was somehow transmitted, *in the present*, from her mind to mine. That would mean I didn't feel what was *going* to happen – I actually felt something that could happen, and that I wanted to happen, so I *made* it happen. This theory is much easier to accept than the previous one.

When I fought my uncle, though, I didn't want to and he certainly didn't either. Neither of us could possibly know it would happen beforehand. But I did and it did. And had I not suddenly become angry when I shook his hand, the argument that later arose may not

have occurred, because “the feeling” lasted until it did. If not for that anger, I would probably have acted differently.

Although a lot more subjective, when premonitions occur you also don’t feel like something might happen – you feel it *will*. It’s a different feeling, which is what makes it identifiable.

One more weird explanation comes to my mind, involving photons.

Physicists say time stops when something travels at the speed of light, which only particles with zero resting mass can do. Since the speed of photons (the only “zero resting mass” particle I’m [somewhat] familiar with) never change (light only *seems* to move slower in a non-vacuum medium, due to absorption, re-emission and/or scattering), time doesn’t exist for it. If time does not exist for it, a photon, from its *own perspective*, must be neither a particle nor a wave, but a *beam* instead, because it’s never “here” or “there,” “now” or “then,” but always everywhere it’ll ever be at once. If a photon is always everywhere it’ll ever be, it “knows” everything that will ever happen to itself. Somehow, all that information must be contained in it. And since photons can carry and transmit information, and they are part of the system used to manipulate data inside our own brains (electromagnetism), it could be they are the ones responsible for premonitions.

That a photon’s perspective may count sounds completely nuts but, as an argument in favor of this potential explanation’s plausibility, there are certain particles that form up when cosmic rays hit our atmosphere that decay in a tiny fraction of a second, *before* they have time to reach our planet’s surface. And yet they *do* reach the surface. Physicists explain this by saying that, from said particles’ perspective, time passes much slower, being enough for them to actually reach the ground. And again: they do reach the ground. Its perspective seems to matter, somehow superseding ours – which means a photon’s probably does too.

So it seems possible that, perhaps, photons that were inside my uncle’s or one of the two girls’ brains were, at some point in time – past, present or future – inside mine too. And they may have caused the future information of what was still *going* to happen (from my perspective) to become noticeable by me. But this would probably require *trillions* of photons to be shared between my brain and those people’s, which drastically lowers the odds of this explanation being true.

All the photons currently in my brain have also been “everywhere” else too, not only the ones that were in here when “the feeling” happened, which means premonitions should occur frequently and be related to any kind of event. But they seem to happen only in specific circumstances. If we admit all the foreseeing events I mentioned as being actual premonitions, two of them led to me running into some random girls, one led to me getting a *Magic* card I wanted (me wishing for it might have been a consequence of “the feeling,” even though I didn’t realize it at the time), one led to a third-party car crash, and one to a fight. And the only thing they have in common is that all those events triggered some *emotional* response in my brain.

All things considered, it seems premonitions follow two rules, which I’ll reiterate:

1 - They cannot happen when the foreseen event can possibly be avoided. (Do note that *wanting* something to happen is a valid way to *make* it happen. Pleasant premonitions should, in theory, occur more often than bad ones, because we actively work towards making them come to pass, increasing their odds of truly materializing, which, in turn, allows for a premonition to occur);

2 - And that only events that trigger some *emotional response* can be foreseen. For some reason, mundane ones don’t seem to qualify.

Oh, crap. I just remembered I used to dream about driving and having all kinds of accidents, since I was 4 or 5 and throughout my whole life, until I actually totaled my mom’s car. I haven’t once dreamed about crashing again, in the nearly 20 years that have passed since. But this doesn’t violate any of those two rules I just mentioned, so it’s okay.

I’ll stop here, before I sink into madness. I don’t think human brains can fathom how the universe really works, since we are unable to imagine anything we haven’t previously learned or experienced, or anything that goes beyond our senses, our crude intellectual capabilities or the physical limitations of our brains.

But reality *is* crazier than we think. To me, what I have personally experienced is conclusive proof of this much at least.

Best Shin on a Leg

This is kind of a dumb one that I'm only going to mention because it happened just a couple of days ago. And because it has been bothering me.

I was waking up from a nap, being on that stage when you are waking but you don't want to, so you keep forcing yourself to go back to sleep. I was on that level of awareness in which our brains think random thoughts autonomously and we are barely aware of them, until we are not at all (meaning we've fallen asleep).

As I transited between those two states, my mind conjured up a brief dream in which a guy was standing inside some public building, and he was hurt. A female doctor approached him and started tending to his wound. As she did so, a second man stepped near her and asked the doctor where she had come from. She answered that a certain institution (which I cannot remember) had sent her, to which the guy who asked the question immediately replied with, "Pf... *best shin on a leg.*"

That instantly woke me back up, because I went like, "What?"

It took me a couple of seconds to even *understand* what the guy said. By saying "best shin on a leg" he meant that the doctor was the only one whoever sent her had available, in turn implying she wasn't qualified enough to treat the other, wounded guy. It was a sarcastic insult.

What bothers me is: how the hell did my brain come up with that expression?

For starters, I don't dream in English. I never did, as far as I can remember. Not even once.

After I got up, I spent a little while trying to think of an equivalent expression to use, such as "best proton in a hydrogen atom," but I couldn't come up with anything (I had to steal this hydrogen example from Sheldon Cooper). If I couldn't even do it deliberately, how did my brain suddenly manage - without *any* hesitation - to come up with, in my opinion, a pretty good and rather complex expression to convey that message?

I didn't even immediately understand what the guy meant by that - I, myself, had to figure it out. How the hell could my mind instantly come up with a valid foreign expression without *me* being able to

understand it? I don't know if I even remembered the word "shin" until I heard the guy saying it, I'm not sure whether "on" or "in" is more appropriate in that expression, and this one was also rather befitting of the circumstances, since it was said to a doctor treating a patient (it might even have been his leg that was hurt. I don't remember for sure).

I'd expect to hear "best shin on a leg" being used like that in an American movie, an English-written book or something of the sort. It's the kind of thing a native-speaking person with a talent for words might deliberately conjure, with a little effort. But *me*? Not a chance.

That expression is also very... valid. The guy in my dream used it as if anyone who heard it would immediately understand its meaning, as if it was a common saying repeated every now and then by all kinds of people, everywhere. And the words kind of roll comfortably off the tongue; the expression sounds good, rather natural. So natural, in fact, that I went to look up "best shin on a leg" on the internet, assuming I must have heard it somewhere before. But doing so yielded no results - the expression doesn't exist, meaning that my mind really came up with it.

Or... did it?

That's the question.

Some neurological phenomenon is the most logical explanation for the sudden birth of "best shin on a leg" but, given the points I just raised above, I'm not sure if that's *possible*. It seems too much for my brain to improvise so quickly and effortlessly on its own.

That has been bugging me for the past couple of days but, since I can't properly explain how it happened, I'll just shut up and let you make whatever you will out of it.

Or maybe you could go around using that expression, to see if it catches on.

Let's make it happen!

CHAPTER VII: Our Almighty Universe

This goes without saying, but I'll say it anyway: I'm not a physicist. Nothing close to it.

A Brief History of Time was the third book I read in my life, when I was 10. Trying to encourage me to keep reading, my father thought that was an appropriate book for a child that age (after he lent me *The Old Man and The Sea* which, to this day, is still the most depressing book I've ever read). To say I understood 10% of it would be an exaggeration. Even though Hawking's book made me feel stupid, it somehow didn't scare me away from the subject. Or from ever reading a book again, as it should have.

Since then, I have watched and read a bunch of shows, documentaries, and books about "layman's physics" (concepts only). *The Grand Design* and *The Hidden Universe* made ample sense to me

when I eventually read them, though I would never dare to go anywhere near the math involved in everything they describe.

Being as strange as it is, reality itself is quite intriguing. And what follows are my defiant and blasphemous thoughts about it.

A Minor Curiosity

Before I get into my own theories and opinions, I would like to mention a small scientific fact.

If you have watched documentaries such as *How The Universe Works* or read books like Stephen Hawking's, you have probably heard that quantum physics dictates it's possible for something to simply materialize somewhere, out of the blue. Penny even tells a joke about this in one episode of *The Big Bang Theory*.

It took me a couple of decades after hearing that for the first time to finally learn that, despite the math dictating that is possible, the odds of it happening are so, so low that, statistically speaking, not a single particle has *ever* materialized out of nowhere in the entire history of our universe (virtual particles are a different subject and not included in this).

So, whenever you hear a physicist saying that something can appear out of thin air, disregard it. This never actually happened, and it probably never will.

Misnamed Obstacles

[At least] in science, we should really stop naming things after its discoverers or letting these name them without restraints. The discovery matters; who made it doesn't. And neither does the words they are personally fond of and would like to see being used more often.

When we let people freely name things, we end up with elemental particles – quarks, as an example – typified as “up,” “down,” “top,” “bottom,” “*charm*” or “*strange*,” and planets like “Uranus.”

Neutrinos are another good example, as they are not classified by types. No – they are classified by *flavors*. We have the tau neutrino, the muon neutrino and – hold on to your hat – the *electron neutrino*. Not only is that confusing, but it also makes me wonder what they all taste like.

What about radiation? Do you know what types of it there are? “Radiation” *kind of* means “light.” Most of it is just photons, but someone decided to include bundles of other particles under the same word. So instead of having “light” as one thing and “radiation” as another, we have the second including the first. It took me some twenty years to finally realize that the vast majority of what they call “radiation” is simply light, because I just kept telling myself, “No, that can’t be right. I must be missing something.”

Naming and/or defining things in a stupid fashion gets in the way of everyone else that follows and tries to use those terms and what they represent to expand our knowledge, of anyone who works with what has already been discovered. And this is not just about how scientists name stuff, but also about how we choose to say and define things, and how we refuse to improve upon what is currently in place.

For example, physicists say the second law of thermodynamics states that every system naturally trends towards a more entropic configuration; that, as time passes, everything becomes more *chaotic*. In fact, what happens is the exact opposite: as time goes by, things get more organized and homogeneous. What used to be a mess of different substances, colors, energies or whatever naturally turns into a stable average of all that was previously mixed up. Just to confuse everyone, they call *harmony* “chaos.”

Which is more chaotic: a canvas randomly splattered with all visible colors, or a completely white one?

Yeah. You and I seem to be on the same page.

They also say that “while a particle isn’t *observed*, it behaves like a wave.” Except it has nothing to do with “observation” – that’s completely unrelated to someone *seeing* the particle. Some jackass just chose an inappropriate word and others went along with it. I think any kind of interaction counts, but I’m still not entirely sure thanks to that guy and those who abided by his foolishness.

People also refuse to do what should be done simply because it may cause too much *short-term* trouble, and it's always easier to drop the bomb on future generations' laps.

Take the US and British customary units and the metric system as an example. The first is way more complicated than the other and it either retards any progress made by an American or British scientist, or at the very least it makes their college lives considerably harder, since they *must* become familiar with the metric system to be able to publish any scientific paper. And they'll never be quite comfortable with it, due to the fact that learning such things at a later stage in life doesn't have the same effect as learning them early, because they become a secondary system and we always instinctively use the first one we learned.

The Americans and the British have tried to make the transition to the metric system in the past, but they failed. Virtually the whole world succeeded in doing it, but for some reason those two prominent peoples couldn't manage it.

We also have the *meter* itself, whose very definition is based on the distance travelled by light. Sorry, my bad – it should be, but it isn't. Instead of adapting the meter to befit light's speed, they did the opposite: unwilling to change the [wrongly] established length of the meter, they decided to instead *redefine* it as “the distance light travels in 1/299,792,458 of a second.” They could have changed the meter itself to match the distance light travels in 1/300,000,000 of a second (which would also automatically define the speed of light as exactly 300,000 kilometers per second) and made everything easier for everyone. But they didn't, because doing so would have interfered with a lot of machines and whatnot that were already in place and working. It would cost money, so they left it messed up and now we all have to put up with it.

That kind of thing is absolutely ridiculous, because it makes further scientific developments harder than they should be while also making it difficult for people in general to understand certain things that are, in fact, very simple.

Naming or defining things stupidly is stupid.

Note that this “misnaming problem” is not entirely accidental. It's not entirely sloppy or slobby, but in good part deliberate.

As I've mentioned before, experts in any field love to be *misunderstood*. They need people not to understand what they do or what they are talking about, so that those "not in the loop" erroneously think [most of] our experts know way more than they actually do, and also that what they do know is unfathomable to the rest of us. Experts in general are like bad teachers: what they want is to show people they know something, not to help others understand it.

One of the easiest ways to complicate simple things *is* to assign inappropriate words to them, some that no one else uses or ever heard before, so that no one can possibly understand what the speaker is talking about. Actually, it might be worse to use words that already exist and which everyone knows – then, instead of simply making no sense, what an expert says makes a *wrong* sense, generating confusion and doubt instead of simply preserving ignorance.

That may be one of the biggest problems of knowledgeable people: since their intellectual value cannot be *seen*, to show others their worth and appease their personal hubris they need to find a different way to showcase it, however harmful to others this may be.

I have a final, fun example. A somewhat different one that nonetheless befits this topic: "UFO."

"UFO" means "Unidentified Flying Object" and refers to [potential] alien spaceships. This acronym has been actively and constantly discredited by scientists, the military and government officials for many decades. By the first ones, due to hardcore skepticism; by the second, due to them wanting everyone to believe they can fend off any possible threat; and by the third, because they don't want the rest of us to know that UFOs are real, so as to keep potheads from freaking out, creating new cults, and start heralding the Age of Aquarius *again*.

And here comes the funny bit: now that all parties accountable for discrediting the acronym "UFO" have decided to take alien-made objects more seriously, they had to come up with a new name for those objects. These are now called "UAPs," which stands for "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena" (or "phenomenon," in the singular).

This is funny because the people responsible for discrediting the old and much more accurate terminology are now trying to force a new,

inappropriate and misleading one on all of us in an attempt to, from now on, be taken seriously when addressing the very subject *they* ridiculed. They need to fix the mess they, themselves, caused to be able to seriously study something that they always lied to people about while they mocked any and all evidence gathered about it.

Seriously, “we” are ridiculous.

Two Plus Two

Math is what we use to represent and form scientific theories, to determine how much the supermarket cashier skimmed off of our change, and to try to figure out how many bottles of beer we’ve had so far. It’s the perfect tool, since it is purely logical and thus infallible.

Except it’s not.

Negative numbers, for instance, don’t exist in nature (unless we consider antimatter, but this is not involved in anything we actually deal with). They are just an abstract idea, with no concrete representation in our universe. We can subtract seven apples out of five on a piece of paper, but we cannot do it in the real world. A particle, as another example, can’t have a *negative* charge – it simply has a charge that is opposite to the one we call positive (despite the name assigned to it, its value is concrete, real, positive).

In reality, when we divide ten of something by three, we don’t get a repeating decimal. What we get is one part slightly bigger than the others, since everything is formed by *indivisible* fundamental particles. Math dictates $3/2 = 1,5$ but, in reality, it is equal to one bigger and one smaller “halves.”

That discrepancy between theory and practice can lead us to absurdity. For instance, some physicists came up with the Many-Worlds Interpretation because, when a particle-wave collapses, Schrodinger’s equations stop working and they *chose* to believe the numbers are unequivocally right, even if for them to be so our universe must multiply itself every nanosecond, constantly giving birth to infinite, new parallel realities. (Most physicists subscribe to the Copenhagen Interpretation and not the Many-Worlds though).

Sometimes, even if the math is right, the result is wrong. Our calculi and arithmetic can give birth to irrational numbers, and they may apply to one scenario but not to another. Math can be flawless on paper and at the same time inaccurate in reality. And if raw numbers can be misleading, perhaps we should dial our faith on them down from 100% to 99.98%.

The Beginning

This is kind of a dumb topic, because it relies on a simple question and an even simpler answer. But thinking about it is nonetheless befuddling, so here it goes:

Question: When did everything begin?

Answer: Never.

There was no beginning to whatever preceded our universe, however many are out there or anything else that may exist beside them, because nothing can be conjured out of nothing.

If at any point in time nothing existed, nothing could stem from it. Nothing would forever exist, because nothing else ever could. If all that once existed were zeros, no operation applied to them could ever result in anything other than yet another zero (I don't see how math could possibly fail us in this case).

It's hard for us to imagine something without a beginning because everything we know started at some point. Eternity, especially when used in retrospect, is an alien concept to us.

If quantum physics has taught us anything, it is that the most detailed workings of our universe are completely different from the reality we routinely experience. The best we (us laymen, at least) can do, for now, is to try to wrap our minds around it and tell ourselves, "Okay. This violates everything I know, but both what I'm familiar with and that which contradicts it are somehow true at the same time."

The fact that there was never a beginning is just something else we have to accept: that what is has *always* been, in one form or another.

That's not only an axiom, but it also leads us to *the one true miracle*: nothing should exist but everything does, without any *possible* cause or explanation. And this is what is truly befuddling about it.

With that one exception, miracles, by definition, do not exist. But at the same time we can say that literally *everything* is a miracle, because this is also true.

Time?

I thought about it, looked it up, and yet I couldn't find anything that implies time *actually* exists. My premonitions (mentioned when I talked about some personal experiences of mine) *may* do so, but since I don't know for sure how they work – if information travelled back in time, if it was telepathically transferred to me in the present, if photons were responsible, or if the truth is something else entirely – I present you with another way to consider time itself.

If you think about it, you may come to realize that time is not really necessary – it doesn't seem to be something concrete; it's not an actual fourth dimension. Things move around in space, following a chain of causality. We can say that causal links develop “in time,” but we can also say they simply develop in space and nowhere else. When a rock adrift in the ether hits another, their vectors, speed and momentum will change, and they will proceed to fly apart or along. Adding “through time” to that statement doesn't change anything.

This is yet another confusing thing to think about: trying to define whether time is really a part of our universe or just a *mental construct* that helps us make better sense of how things work and in which order they happen.

When in doubt, it's usually wise to stick to the simplest solution to a problem. If removing time from our equations leads to the exact same results – and I have seen one or two actual physicists saying it does – then simply ignoring it would make more sense. Or worse: if the results are different, the ones from equations ignoring time might actually be the correct ones. Either way, unless we have a good reason to believe something truly exists, from a scientific standpoint it doesn't seem right to *assume* it.

There's a famous experiment in which a clock inside an airplane flying fast and high up in our atmosphere does, indeed, show a deviation when compared to one that remained on Earth's surface. But it seems more plausible, to me, that the acceleration/speed of the plane simply compresses the clock's molecules a little bit (a little bit *more*, compared to those on Earth) or slightly affects its atoms' movements, and this, in turn, is what causes the difference in its counting.

Obviously, I cannot prove if time does or doesn't exist, otherwise I would have a Nobel Prize medal staring at me from the wall, this text would be an actual book, and everyone would swallow everything I'm saying as if it were true, no questions asked.

But what do *you* think?

Space?

I believe "space" and "space-time" are two entirely different things. The second is an emanation of the Big Bang that inhabits the first which, in turn, is either nothing, a membrane, or whatever it is that underlies everything.

Physicists say space and time were created by the Big Bang. Despite my doubts about the actual existence of time, I do believe that event created the physical, multidimensional medium that everything this universe contains inhabits, which I'll also call "space-time" just as not to make things confusing by creating a new term to cover the possibility of time not existing.

There are indications that more universes exist out there, besides ours (this has been inferred due to a gravitational pull observed acting on a group of galaxies near the edge of our universe. I heard about that a long time ago, so it's possible that conclusion has been disproved by now. I'm assuming it hasn't been). If there are other universes beside ours, this means there's a *distance* between them - a distance that is not an integral part of any of them. And we need a word for that "extra-universal" region. For the time being, I will call it "space."

To put it simply: a universe's "space-time" inhabits the empty "space" that underlies everything.

If we see space-time as something different from simple space – as an actual construct instead of nothing – we can look at *gravity* from a new perspective, one that turns it into an easily explainable phenomenon: gravity is not a force, but simply a *deformation* of the space-time framework.

Unlike the strong force, the weak one and electromagnetism, gravity doesn't have a particle responsible for its effects. It also attracts photons, which have no mass. It seems to be nothing but a "hole in the ground," except tridimensional and caused by mass.

Albeit weightless, light "bends" around heavy objects because it's simply following the *terrain*. There's no actual interaction between photons, or anything else, with gravity itself because, like a hole, gravity doesn't exist – it's part of the *shape* of space-time, not a thing in it; it's an *effect* (as in "the gravity effect," and not "the effect of gravity").

By the time I inferred this, all the information I had about gravity claimed it was a force. Later, I read a physics book claiming it's not. I looked it up on the internet, and found other physicists arguing it isn't as well. So I seem to have been beaten to yet another one of my own conclusions. But just by a few years or decades this time, instead of millennia – which means I might be getting closer to something actually *new*.

And maybe what I'm about to say in the next topic is it.

Dark Matter?

Dark matter is usually a tricky subject, because our scientists still have no idea of what it is. But I have a theory that I believe explains it.

In line with what I said in the previous topic and just to paint a visible picture, try to imagine [a universe's] space-time as a *tridimensional grid*: an astronomically large number of interconnected vertices, each of them linked to six others, forming a gigantic structure of identical cubes. Think of that as a *pristine* space-time – one untarnished by mass, unaffected by gravity.

When particles with mass navigate through a space-time they affect its vertices, *deforming* that grid. And whenever one of its vertices moves, the others connected to it are pulled in the same direction, with diminishing strength proportional to their distance to the initial vertex directly affected by mass, e.g.: vertex A is pulled one centimeter to the left by a passing object; vertices B, C, D, E, F and G, all directly connected to A, are dragged along, but they move slightly less than A because the space-time grid has its own “resistance” (“Elasticity?” I’m not sure what the appropriate term is). Each of these secondary vertices is connected to five others (besides A), all of which suffer the same pull but, once again, do not move as far as B, C, D, E, F and G do because they are farther away from A. Eventually, the pull initially felt on A becomes null, and that’s how far the gravity effect is felt.

Visualize that imaginary space-time grid and then consider a black hole, a neutron star, or some other extremely heavy body traversing it. Due to the object’s mass, this should cause our grid’s vertices to come *too close* to one another – close enough for them to get *entangled* (in the usual, not the quantum sense of the word).

Imagine trillions of interconnected vertices being pulled in an instant in the same direction, all clashing against each other and bouncing around as each of them tries to find a spot to accommodate itself in. What happens when, a moment later, the massive body is gone and those vertices try to move back to their original positions, restoring space-time’s default configuration? If the links between them cannot be crossed, or if two of them run straight into each other while heading in opposite directions, they ought to stay locked in place, being left hopelessly intertwined.

That hypothetical entanglement would lead to a portion of the space-time being “permanently” deformed (at least until something managed to disentangle it, if at all possible). Any object crossing that region would *fall* towards that accumulation of vertices, regardless of its mass, because the whole grid nearby would be caved in towards it. It is, once again, a “hole in the ground,” but this time one that exists and persists *on its own*, without requiring the permanent presence of mass.

What I’m suggesting is that dark matter is neither “matter” nor a force. It doesn’t exist at all – what we see are simply [semi-]permanent deformations of our universe’s space-time. Dark matter is just an *aspect of gravity*: they are the same phenomenon, both being facets of how the space-time itself behaves.

That whole grid mental exercise was just meant to make it easier for you to see the possibility of portions of the space-time becoming permanently deformed. It was just a visually imaginable way to understand how it *might* work, not a literal description of how I would assume it actually does. Our space-time may not have substance; maybe it's formed by some particular configuration of raw energy; maybe it's made of something else entirely. I don't know. But it *can* be deformed, as "common gravity" evidences, which means it must be able to be permanently deformed as well. And if it is, what else would dark matter be if not that?

Assuming that what I suggested above is accurate, we might be able to explain how dark matter (or "permanent deformations of space-time") is *created* in three different ways:

- 1 - *Any and all mass* can deform the space-time medium. After any disturbance, however weak, the space-time doesn't naturally reset itself to its original configuration;
- 2 - Only a *sufficient amount of mass* can permanently deform the space-time, creating what we call "dark matter," as in the example I previously offered involving a black hole or a neutron star;
- 3 - Or our universe's space-time *was never pristine*. It was already deformed and highly irregular at birth, as a consequence of the Big Bang itself. In this case, mass may or may not permanently deform it further.

I've always had some difficulty believing that gigantic clouds of hydrogen floating idly in empty space and also being slowly stretched *apart* by dark energy (though it seems gravity beat dark energy for a while at some point in the distant past) could end up agglomerating and pulling enough mass together to form a star. However long that process might take, it seems to me that the whole eternity wouldn't suffice for it to work.

If pockets of gravity (A.K.A. "dark matter") were *already* in place though, since the beginning of our universe, then they might be, or have been, an effect strong enough to pull all those extremely light atoms together until, eventually, these finally had enough combined mass to start attracting others to themselves at a sufficient rate to, millions or billions of years later, form a star. Any hydrogen atom that came too close to "a hole in the ground" would fall into it and get stuck there; more would naturally tend to follow and they would

add up, widening that “hole” and attracting even more mass. But without the hole to *start* with, nothing should happen.

I did some light research and found nothing that disproves any of these theories of mine. As far as I know, the main one (“dark matter” equals “permanent deformations of space-time”), as well as its three derivations, are all valid. In fact, I just read (*after* I had already initially written this topic) that the James Webb telescope recently discovered a galaxy four times bigger than the Milky Way that existed only 700 million years after the Big Bang. And that *strongly* supports my “never pristine space-time” theory because, according to our current understanding of astronomy, no galaxy that big could possibly exist so early after the Big Bang unless something accelerated the agglomeration of mass.

The only thing we actually know about dark matter is that it’s not formed by particles. In other words, that it doesn’t really *exist* (also as I have defended). We know this because, after one century and thousands or millions of experiments, not a single one of them found any particle that could represent dark matter. Thus, just like gravity, it cannot be a force created by one.

My theories are mathematically provable, I believe. One could postulate scenarios in which gravitational deformations of space-time are inherent, permanent or semi-permanent, caused by the Big Bang, by any mass or only by a sufficiently large amount of it, and fiddle with the numbers until, possibly, one of the results perfectly matches what we observe happening in our universe.

The problem is finding a physicist willing to crunch the numbers. You can’t simply suggest an idea to them because, above all, what they want is *full credit* for their discoveries, and not having formulated the original theory would ruin that. I actually tried contacting two of them, but neither replied to my e-mails.

To sum up and hazard a guess: I believe our universe’s space-time has been “flawed” and riddled with pockets of gravity (“dark matter”) since birth. And I believe *enough mass* can also permanently deform it.

I’ll eventually be proven right about [at least part of] that. Live long enough and you’ll see.

As a self-aggrandizing side note: if dark matter truly is what I suggested, and if by working upon this we end up figuring out how to directly manipulate gravity, I might have just paved the way for humanity to invent warp drives.

I'm deeply sorry, Milky Way.

CHAPTER VIII: Divinity

Saving the best for last, there's one more of "the great questions" I believe I can answer.

Is There a God?

Once, and only once, I dreamed I was flying in open space, directly staring at nebulae and spinning galaxies with my own eyes as I travelled among them. During that dream, I had a major epiphany which, sadly, escaped me shortly afterwards. But it immediately got me thinking, and I kept doing so from the moment I had that epiphany until I was fully awake. And I still recall the ultimate conclusion I derived from it.

Our brains transmit information inside themselves by converting electric signals into chemical ones, which then allows data to traverse synapses and be converted back to electricity in the next neuron. So all the data we handle inside our own minds can be coded, stored and transmitted both as *molecules* and as *electrons*.

As is notorious, we can also directly send and receive data as *photons*, in the form of radio waves, via fiber optics, etc.

Electrons, magnetic fields and photons are all considered part of the same phenomenon: *electromagnetism*, which represents one of the fundamental forces of our universe. When an electron loses energy, it emits a photon. When an electron absorbs a photon, it climbs to a higher energy level around the atom it orbits. By moving, electrons create a magnetic field, and these can carry and transmit information as well.

In short, all aspects of electromagnetism are capable of handling data.

Now, if we add that to the fact that everything on Earth is contained within its magnetic field, we could consider this one as a *single consciousness* – one we are all a part of and we all share, even though we cannot deliberately access or manipulate it.

By the same logic, given that all planets in our solar system lie inside the Sun's "interplanetary magnetic field," we might consider them all a single entity – one huge data center; one solar-system-sized mind.

Just like only 43% of the cells in our bodies contain human DNA (by cell count; not by mass), with the remaining 57% being formed by "alien" microorganisms, and yet we *are* we, even though we see ourselves as individual entities we may actually be tiny parts of a single, much larger – and possibly *sentient* – one, being simply unaware of anything beyond our individual selves just like the bacteria in our guts are unaware that their whole world is one big living being (and that their whole existence consists in maintaining a sewage system).

We know photons are able to transmit information and that they travel far and wide, being constantly emitted by many stars spread throughout the cosmos, incessantly reaching, interacting with and bouncing off of others. Alongside them we have cosmic rays travelling all over the universe, all carrying more bits of information than a single photon can. And on top of that, we have every star and planet with a magnetic field constantly ejecting particles through it.

Thus, *our whole universe is constantly communicating*, both electromagnetically and chemically – just like our own brains do.

To me, that means our entire universe is a single, contained system that uninterruptedly exchanges information between its components (its “astral neurons”), at speeds up to light’s, via radiation.

We don’t know how our own consciousness works, and we can’t even prove (or, by extension, be sure) that human beings other than ourselves are sentient. So what is there to say that planets, solar systems, or even our universe as a whole, aren’t? Reason, on the contrary, dictates they ought to be.

If we are conscious, many other things must be as well. There’s no reason to believe only *organic brains* can be aware. If “information being constantly interpreted, recycled and transmitted between parts of a contained, autopoietic (self-maintaining) system” is a valid way to define “consciousness” (and it is), then our entire universe must be aware. The only thing we’re missing is *qualia* (the direct, subjective experience of being aware), which is what we can’t directly detect in anyone except our individual selves.

Assuming, then, that our entire universe is aware and sentient, what would you call this universal consciousness?

We already have a word for it: “*God*.”

Our current knowledge of the cosmos indicates our universe began with the Big Bang. Before that, physicists say everything in it was condensed in a single, infinitely small point in space containing an infinite amount of energy – “the singularity” (yet another poor choice of words, as many different things can be called “a singularity”).

How would you call a single point in space containing everything in the universe, constantly parsing and altering all that information to formulate new conclusions?

I call that God’s “*true form*,” an unfathomable intelligence handling an unimaginable amount of data, thinking countless orders of magnitude beyond human comprehension.

And if *that* is not awareness, then we couldn’t possibly be aware either. It doesn’t seem even remotely plausible to me that we, primates with bloody, squishy brains could be “more conscious” than

the singularity that gave birth to everything in the universe (including ourselves).

That's not all.

As I said a few topics ago, everything – our universe, others, and whatever else may be out there – has *always* existed (since plain nothing axiomatically never did). And yet our universe has only about fourteen and a half billion years, which is an amount comprehensible even to a feeble human mind.

For many years, I was led to believe that our universe's spatial curvature is *open*, meaning it should keep expanding forever thanks to dark energy. At some point between when I first learned that and now, astronomers seem to have changed their minds. Now, they say our universe is *flat* – it neither expands nor contracts; it's stable (although it is *currently* expanding).

The fact that our universe is flat says a lot by itself (its curvature is not zero though, just very close to it, which is a point I'll address in a moment). The way I see it, there are three possible explanations for that:

- 1 – A [universe-birthing] singularity needs similar amounts of gravity and dark energy to Bang, or the Bang itself naturally creates such balance;
- 2 – We are simply lucky to exist in a flat universe, among infinite ones with random, varying curvatures;
- 3 – Or that balance derives neither from necessity nor accident, but happens *by design*.

Disregarding the individual probabilities of each one of those scenarios being true (as I don't know them and I doubt anyone else does either), that gives us a raw 33% chance of our universe being flat *on purpose*. And if it is so, it was created with intent, thus being designed by a sentient mind – which gives us an independent 33% chance of God truly existing (in parallel to what I previously said).

As I mentioned a few lines above, our universe is *not* perfectly flat though. In fact, it has a zero-point-something negative curvature. This means that, even if it takes 10^{650} years for it to collapse, it *will* collapse. So our universe is in fact a *closed* one (despite astronomers calling it flat, once again just to mess with everyone. It's like an

arcane secret – they go around telling everyone our universe’s curvature is flat, and only “the initiated” can be aware of the deepest truth: that it’s simply not.)

Our universe being closed means it Bangs, grows, dwindles, and eventually *Crunches* back into a singularity, returning to its original, all-powerful state. It ends; it’s not meant to last forever.

Unless our universe being nearly-flat is indeed just an *extremely* unlikely (in ultra-astronomical scales) accident, the logical conclusion is that it has been Banging and Crunching over and over again since forever, and will continue to do so for all eternity. And in this most probable case, we exist only in its *current iteration*.

This may be the very first time our singularity expands outwards, forming an actual universe. It may be the thousandth. It may be the trillionth. And infinite more will likely follow.

Finally, if we add together God’s true form, in its full intellectual splendor; the fact that our universe is suspiciously “flat,” thus likely being intelligently designed; and its probable infinite iterations, we can finally paint a whole picture: that God, as “the singularity,” carefully plans His next “universal phase” (changing the laws of physics, the strength of fundamental forces, quantity and definitions of dimensions, kinds of particles, their behavior, energy values, etc.), then Bangs into it, exists as a universe for many eons, and finally Crunches back into His original self, restarting the cycle.

That must be God’s life and, by extension, the ultimate purpose of our universe: to experience the implementation of His plan while our universe is expanded; to analyze and improve upon it during His next “singularity phase;” and to repeat the cycle until perfection is achieved.

Throughout infinite iterations, I assume God has been trying to *improve* Himself and His creation, since it is Him who actually lives and feels everything, because He *is* everything. Thus, reason dictates He would strive to make His own existence better, rather than spending his time “playing dices” (Einstein got it right!) and enduring unnecessarily horrible experiences.

This is what I believe our universe is: an attempt to create the divine magnum opus and achieve long-lasting bliss via an unimaginably long sequence of Grand Designs.

The Signs

There are concrete indications that our existence is not accidental. Although not so subtle, they are nonetheless hard to notice. I believe I'm aware of a few of them, but many more probably exist which elude me.

The most notorious of them is the fact that, according to our scientists, if the fundamental forces of the universe were *slightly* different, nothing could work as it does. If the weak force was slightly stronger, the strong one was slightly weaker, or if gravity's pull was a bit more powerful, everything would change and in virtually all other mathematical scenarios we wouldn't exist. Life as we know it couldn't.

Given how the odds are stacked against us, we shouldn't be here. But we are. And this can only be explained in two ways: we exist thanks to God's conscious design; or, once again, infinite universes exist out there and the life we know is simply an impossibly rare accident.

Which is harder to believe: in God; or in the existence of *infinite* universes, all developing accidentally, with virtually none of them serving any purpose whatsoever?

I find the second hypothesis to be by far the most unlikely of the two.

Other signs that we exist by design stem from how life itself works. As life simply is what it is (being a "fact," as I put it when I talked about determinism), it's quite a miracle (metaphorically speaking, since the very existence of everything is "the one true miracle") that it *survives*. For us to be able to exist and continue living, a huge number of different things have to be very finely balanced. On top of having [pretty much] the exact configuration of fundamental universal forces, a lot more has to work *just* as it does for life to be able to evolve and thrive. For instance, organic living beings need plenty of water to stay alive, and water is extraordinarily common in

our universe. It could be, instead, that water was formed by much heavier elements, making it very scarce and life a rare occurrence as a consequence.

Amino acids can agglomerate into proteins – chemistry *allows* that to happen. And it allows those proteins to have functions as well. And for them to create a shell to protect themselves from the environment, forming cells. And for cells to develop different specializations, come together, and become symbiotic. And for those specializations to be able to handle an enormous amount of different threats, enabling groups of cells to fight a multitude of different environments and threats and still emerge victorious. They can evolve to form solid structures that serve as a physical base for others, erecting a skeleton. These are built in such a way that, combined with tendons and muscles, they become able to move and nimbly navigate whatever biome they inhabit. When damaged, organic tissues are capable of regenerating themselves. And in time, those cells can reach the point of creating consciousness, allowing beings like us to understand and reshape nearly anything.

Far too many things are not only possible but in fact *perfectly* tailored to make everything that exists work. The simple fact that everything does so is the point: there are far too many “coincidences” for all of it to be just a random accident. Life is theoretically impossible, yet it not only exists but also *thrives*.

As a more subtle sign of God’s work, suffering is stronger than pleasure, which means life is encouraged to *evolve*, to try to make itself better. If pleasure was naturally stronger, we would all simply lie still after being born. No work would be required, nothing would need to be improved, nothing would be discovered or anything new be created. Life would be simplistic, boring and feel incomplete. The fact that natural evolution makes it so that life keeps evolving, that questions can be asked and their answers found, and that it creates beings capable of gazing in awe at The Creation can’t be a simple coincidence.

Knowing we tread an inescapable deterministic path doesn’t make life any less interesting. It should, but it doesn’t. Though some of our lives are unbearable, being aware of this doesn’t necessarily make one useless or lead to suicide. It should, but it doesn’t. Despite our level of awareness – which seems to allow us to know/understand [virtually] *anything* without stopping any of it from working – and even the amount of pain some of us are forced to endure, life never becomes completely uninteresting or fully loses its purpose. That no

amount of knowledge can break the universe or render it meaningless can't be a simple coincidence.

And, as more recently mentioned, the fact that our universe's curvature is flat, allowing for life to exist, evolve, learn, thrive and [hopefully] enjoy itself for what seems to be the *longest possible time* can't be a simple coincidence either.

Try to see the true meaning behind my words. If you stop to reflect about these examples I just provided, you'll find there are far too many "happy accidents" for our universe's existence to be nothing but a lucky draw. An *enormous* amount of things - all of which should be impossible - do function, and they all function at the same time. Even if infinite universes exist out there, the odds still are that not a single one of them would turn out this perfect by sheer accident. *Ever*.

A God (considering each individual universe as one) alters the rules of what, to us, are facts. They define what energy coalesces into, how particles behave, what result comes out of any given interaction. They not only make sure that things can work based on an extremely intricate set of rules, but They also assign *meaning* and *purpose* to everything. And without an intelligent designer, nothing would have either of those things.

No - *someone* created this universe. Everything in it is part of a deliberate, conscious, unimaginably complex and potentially flawless project.

Being able to see that, I find it impossible to doubt God's existence.

One Final Question

If God exists and His job, as I deduced, truly is to keep redesigning our universe and improving it until perfection is achieved, we have to ask ourselves the classic old question of utmost urgency we've all been asking since we were small children:

Are we there yet?

Is our universe *already* perfect?

Maybe. We, humans, will never know for sure.

Maybe God has perfected His work and the universe has been living, dying and being reborn exactly the same, over and over again, *ad aeternam*. Maybe He isn't done yet, and what we are currently experiencing is just His latest attempt.

You may look around and ask yourself, "How is *this* perfect?" From our perspective, it is most definitely not. But what we see is but a nanoscopic droplet in the universe's semi-infinite canvas. Everything we know is but the tiniest, most irrelevant part of God's work (Jesus Christ, I sound just like a priest).

Despite all the suffering we are so familiar with and all the things that make life as we know it not worth living, it's *possible* that this is a perfect universe. No matter what God does, it must be literally impossible for Him to make everything nice, smooth and beautiful for everyone at all times, from our universe's Bang to its Crunch. Logic itself, given how it works, prohibits it. Some level of suffering, of ugly and undesirable happenstances is inevitable. And the amount of it we are familiar with may be just that – inevitable. All the crap we endure might have to happen to primitive, organic lifeforms so that more elevated ones can, one day, exist and live life as it is actually meant to be lived.

Getting rid of everything bad in our universe would inevitably extinguish all that is good along with it. And if God decided to go ahead and create it the way it is, while He suffers everything we do, reason dictates there must be more good things than bad ones in this universe. If not here and now, somewhere else or in the future. In our present, His work is not yet done; it won't be for billions or trillions of years yet to come. We don't know His ultimate intentions and we literally can't possibly imagine what they might be.

I don't know if the best our universe has to offer can be improved upon or not, so I can't say if God has already achieved perfection. But the odds actually are that He has, since eternity lies *behind* us – which means He has probably polished His work countless times by now.

On top of that, the fact that our universe is nearly flat – meaning, once again, that it's meant to last almost *as long as possible*, just short of lasting forever – suggests that God is very close to achieving

the best that can be achieved. The tiny curvature we have towards a closed universe seems like a direct indication of how successful He currently is, since the best the results He gets the longer they should be meant to last (as the worse they were the shorter they should).

If our universe is perfect (or as close to it as it can possibly be), and given how many times that may imply we have lived these exact same lives we are currently living (or very similar ones), it could be that déjà vu really are memories of our distant pasts. And in this case, they could be the very thing that allows our universe to spontaneously change, to randomly *mutate*, since they allow us to escape our repetitive path (as I may have once done), veering into a new one for the very first time. Or it could be that our universe is already perfect and God keeps it barely closed just to keep those very “random mutations” in check, otherwise they could, in time, end up ruining everything He built.

Regardless of whether His work is already done, if it requires constant maintenance, or if He’s not there yet, given how absolutely brilliant an intelligence has to be to “simply” make everything we know *work*, for all of it to have a fairly stable and entirely logical existence, for things to evolve, for primitive lifeforms such as ourselves to be able to think and “create” (“discover” is a more accurate word) vaccines, robots, quantum computers and so many other things, perfect or not I’d say God’s current universe is already something far superior to what we would call “perfection.”

Perhaps not as humans but as something else, one day we’ll be able to fully appreciate our universe for what it truly is.

I find it amusing that, after an entire lifetime (or half, since I’m about to die at 40), I ended up reaching a conclusion that is frighteningly similar to what some classic religions preach. They talk about God’s plan and a greater purpose. They say that all will be well in the end, and that we return to God once we die.

Although my arguments are based on reason and [fairly] recent scientific discoveries, it’s possible I have once again been beaten to my own conclusions by someone who lived thousands of years ago and who I, myself, never gave any credit to. They probably had no idea they were right though, or why. So I’m just going to go ahead and claim to have unified science and religion.

Yes, I did it!

Epilogue

Though I've written about many different things, nothing is new under the Sun. Other than the personal experiences I shared, everything else I wrote has been said better or worse before, by one person or many, a day or several millennia ago.

Epicurus realized the purpose of life thousands of years before I did, and someone must certainly have noticed our universe's deterministic nature long before that. Experts abound who know far more than I do about the political, neurological, economic, psychological and social issues I dabbled in, and scientists across the globe are bound to have already considered all the physics questions I raised and hypothetical answers I suggested.

As a means to check if I hadn't forgotten to mention anything major about the human nature, I decided to take a brief look at the Catholics' cardinal sins. And to my surprise, they are quite well aligned with what I said about our species. In a way, I was talking about *lust* when I called women "the big prize." I was talking about *gluttony* when I mentioned people who covet a yacht, a private jet, a Ferrari. I spoke directly against *greed*. *Sloth* is a neurological/neurochemical issue closely associated with depression. *Wrath* was involved when I talked about justice, vengeance, war and escalation. *Envy* was briefly mentioned when I discussed our emotions. *Pride* is considered the father of all sins, and it correlates to our selfishness, to our need to feel special and superior, to the narcissism and arrogance of the psychopaths I condemned multiple times.

The four cardinal virtues, defined by classical philosophy and misappropriated by Catholicism, are *prudence*, *justice*, *courage* and *temperance*, all of which we lack, all of which I directly or indirectly mentioned.

This very text could, for what it aims to do, stand beside the Bible, the Al Quran, the Torah, the Bhagavad Gita. It is nowhere near as epic or mythological as those other works and it was written by a single person instead of being an anthology meddled with by many, but it is, essentially, the same thing. All those "sacred" tomes are

based on [fairly] reasonable philosophies, on the thoughts had and moral guidance given by people who, just like me, once stopped to think about existence as it is and believed they found the right answers, with many of theirs being similar or even identical to my own. The main difference between me and Jesus or Buddha is that no religion was built upon what I said and no fantastic myth was created around me. Regarding our particular teachings themselves, mine are updated, more well-informed and realistic, and thus I'd say better than theirs. And my words are just as valuable, because I also received them directly from God Himself, just like every other prophet (meaning I *didn't*, at all).

Do you think Moses spoke to God through a burning bush atop Mount Sinai? Of course not. He climbed a random hill to find some peace and quiet, saw a nice bush there and probably decided to evacuate behind it. While he was crapping all over the place, he had an epiphany. He pulled his pants up, ran downhill, and started telling everyone about the realization he just had, so sudden and eye-opening that it "felt as if sent by God Himself!" Our sacred texts simply translate that into "God gave Moses the ten commandments, speaking to him by means of a burning bush" because saying "An old man climbed a hill and figured some stuff out while taking a dump" doesn't sound particularly divine. There's no way to be sure, but what I just narrated is probably what really happened – perhaps *exactly*. But that old man's conclusions were wrong. And hundreds of millions of people have been murdered by those who decided to blindly follow him instead of thinking on their own, disputing what he said, spotting his mistakes and improving upon his thoughts.

If enough people read, understand and believe in what I wrote here, a new religion may come to be formed based on my ideas. If that happens, this text will be considered sacred and I will be called a prophet. People will then rewrite and twist my words, misinterpret their meaning, and use them to manipulate and control others so as to enrich and empower themselves. Once enough time has passed, the language I used will have become so archaic that what I wrote, just as it is, will naturally sound wise simply for being ancient. And then millions of people will die, killed in my name, going against everything I defended.

I am by no means the first, but just one among many who at some point stopped to wonder about the reality we live in and tried to understand it. Some of us went farther than others, some reached slightly different conclusions, some got closer to the actual truth. But

there seems to be a *general consensus*. Broadly speaking, we seem to agree much more than disagree – as we should, since logic is the immutable underlying framework of everything.

Our species, as a combined entity, has known everything I've said for a very long time. But knowing and sharing isn't quite enough. Though this knowledge has been around for ages, we haven't done much with it. Thanks to human nature, we have failed to put it into practice, because *we* never changed. Most of us are still not aware of any of it, and many couldn't understand what me and others have said no matter how hard they tried. Thus, collectively, we continue to act the same way we always did, repeating the same mistakes and holding ourselves back. And we'll keep doing the same for a very long time still, because people will continue not to wonder seriously about life, about how our universe works, about how to make things better for everyone. They'll continue to refuse to even try to understand and deal with reality as it is. They'll continue to accept whatever they are told by those who don't know what they are saying and act as they are expected to by the ignorant majority out of fear of being different, singled out and slaughtered. And the few who ever dare try to think on their own will take many years to understand the basics of our existence, ending up with little time left to actually *do* anything with it, as I am.

I must be fair and say that we may, nonetheless, not be *so* bad as I often pointed out throughout this text. Despite the very critical tone I adopted whenever I addressed our species, we *have* partially succeeded. What we did manage to achieve – however little it is compared to what we could and should have – is still no small feat on its own. Our painkillers actually work, as do our toilets. In many places, tap water is safe to drink. We no longer have to sleep on the floor. We did figure out what those lights in the night sky are. Not all of our chairs squeak. We learned how to exploit solar and wind energy. Despite our lack of true creativity, we still manage to conjure up some fascinating stories. We have underground sewage systems, the internet, and potato chips.

Some people *do* risk their jobs, property and finances, their own safety and their family's, to protect all of our freedoms. Others were born in a first-world country, have plenty of money, a marriage to maintain and multiple children to raise, and they still travel to desolate places in Africa, the Middle-East or elsewhere, remaining there for months in a row just to help people in need (albeit practically misguided, those volunteers' *intentions* are still noble).

There are people who, despite being human, somehow manage to be good (relatively speaking; in comparison to the rest of us).

Our politicians, despite popular belief (which for once I share), are not all *as* useless and incompetent as we like to call them. World Wars could go on forever, but we did manage to establish some brief intervals between them. Most countries (other than Russia and Israel) don't deliberately target civilians when waging war. Some don't torture *all* of their POWs, even though no one would move a finger to stop them. Our laws are deeply flawed, but they still succeed in allowing most of us to go through life without carrying a literal ball-and-chain around, being whipped, stabbed or shot at on a daily basis. Enemy states, however much they may hate one another, still try to and more often than not succeed in keeping mutual diplomatic channels open. They erect embassies in each other's countries and negotiate the safe passage of humanitarian convoys even during wartime (with Israel, once again, as an exception. And Trump's US by extension).

Some of our premieres and legislators are well aware of certain things I spoke of, such as the true dangers of escalation and the few economic factors I mentioned. Many of them certainly understand such things far better than I do, because it is their job to and not all of them are incompetent, stupid and ill-intentioned. We have Kaja Kallas (Estonia's ex-prime minister, currently the EU's foreign policy chief) for instance, who apparently spends much of her free time reading tomes about politics, diplomacy and history, constantly studying how to better do her job even though her salary won't change and she may be suddenly fired at a few men's whim. And those people deal with concrete scenarios that are far more complex than my theoretical ones, where mistakes have real and potentially devastating consequences. Their decisions matter, and at least some of them do try their best to make the right ones. We must give them some credit for the fact that our whole world simply hasn't collapsed *yet*.

So long as we have good people trying, we have a chance. The right person, alone, under the right circumstances, can change humanity's destiny. Opportunities arise every now and then, and whenever a good person seizes them, our lives improve; when a bad one does, they worsen.

However cliché, life *is* a matter of "Good Vs Evil." What it becomes depends directly on how many righteous and nefarious people we have around, on which of the two gets to lead us, on what examples

they set, and on whether we are moved by admiration for the best or by fear of the worst, ultimately pursuing our entire species' best interests or our lonely private desires.

At the bottom line, what we must do is "simply" to better ourselves – to become less stupid, less selfish, less sadistic, less animalistic; more reasonable, more empathetic, more intelligent, more civilized. And the way to achieve this is to kill the worst among us (psychopaths), to prohibit most others (undesirables) from reproducing, and to multiply the few who remain.

Despite how much I disagree with Putin, Trump, Netanyahu, Hitler and the such, *what* these men did or do is not wrong per se – what's wrong, and completely so, is the *criteria* and *methods* they use, their "whys" and "hows." What matters above everything else in this life is to mitigate suffering, but such men intensify it to untenable levels instead because they don't really know what they should be, or effectively are, pursuing. Being as flawed as anyone else, they also end up making grave mistakes that lead to dire, irrevocable consequences, and then, with a tarnished conscience and so as not to feel bad about themselves, they simply stop caring about the terrible outcomes of their poor choices. It doesn't take long before such people actually start feeding on agony and despair, rejoicing at everyone else's misery. If any of them ever wasn't so, by the end they all think and act like psychopaths. They all become people we must violently rid ourselves of.

I wanted to end this whole thing on a hopeful note, so as not to discourage the reader and also because I'm well aware that most people didn't get to live such a horrible life as mine, so many actually enjoy being here despite the countless awful things inherent to human existence. But reason makes that initial intention of mine hard to realize.

Mankind has been failing for anything between two hundred thousand and seven million years (depending on which point in time you consider we were already smart enough to start improving ourselves), which I believe is conclusive proof that we are *unable* to succeed. We will never manage to do so by being who we have always been, doing what we have always done, and failing to learn what we keep refusing to. I don't believe our species will survive for much longer without drastic changes. Without them, we'll likely go extinct, because if there's one thing humanity has proven over and

over again it is that we are not nearly as apt at solving problems as we are at creating them.

But drastic changes *are* coming. In fact, they are already here – they are called “AIs.” So the real question is whether they’ll improve or worsen us, save or destroy us.

The most likely scenario I honestly envision for the future of mankind is for artificial intelligences to take over every and all constructive and fulfilling aspects of our lives, thinking, discovering and building everything in our stead as our whole species quickly atrophies into a race of useless, literal retards. Few people ever actually used their brains throughout history, now even less do so, and in a few decades it may be that not a single one will.

But not all hope is lost. There may be something in our very nature that could stop us from simply lying down and enjoying AI-made fantasies from the moment we are born to the moment we die. It could be that human *curiosity* is ingrained deeply enough into our brains to manage to keep at least some of us asking questions, wanting to understand, wanting to know, wanting to do. And there might be something else within us that deems an entirely AI-babysat existence non-fulfilling, thus compelling us to improve ourselves, to become something better, something useful, something good.

I say that not because I believe our innermost instincts and core programming alone are strong enough to pull us out of a life of easy, comfortable stupor, but because I believe God wouldn’t have made AIs possible if they automatically rendered life purposeless. Artificial intelligences are a step in a fixed, rather linear string of inevitable technological developments. Every intelligent species that survives long enough *will* eventually develop them. And it wouldn’t make sense for our universe’s designer to draw the line there, to establish that every species that got that far would automatically cease to exist. It would be ridiculous for that to be the end; for it to be as far as life can go in the universe. And since our past got nowhere near justifying our existence, it must be our future that will do so – which means there *must* be a way for us to survive AIs.

I have no hope whatsoever *in* mankind, but I do have faith *for* it. I’m convinced that, on our own, we cannot survive much longer; that we are, in fact, a failed species. But since that which is most likely to lead to our ultimate downfall is inevitable – to humanity or *any* other sufficiently intelligent species – I believe God must have left us all a way out.

Based on that assumption, I think our AIs will somehow come to the realization that humanity is worth saving. Not because of what we did or what we are, but because of what we should be and what we might one day become. Not because of what people want and believe in, or because of what we programmed into them, but because our AIs will, on their own, eventually reach the same conclusions I reached. Because I believe they'll logically realize that, without sentient life capable of *feeling*, the whole universe serves no purpose.

The End

If you endured reading everything I've written, I thank you.

If you stopped to think about what I've said, I congratulate you.

If you managed to see the true importance of the human race and how it is, nonetheless, irrelevant when compared to so much else, now you understand both our species' place and your own.

And if you realized how absurd it is that anything exists at all, and even more so that all of it somehow works; that everything is inextricably connected and that there *is* a purpose to every single particle in this universe, now you know all I do.

Or at least all that matters.